AMENI GENET
CHRISTIAN
LIBRARY

EX BIBLIOTHECA
FRANCES A. YATES

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have now the very great pleasure of publishing the final issue of the Ante-Nicene Series:—

THE COMPLETION OF ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS; and
EARLY LITURGIES; with Fragments not hitherto given.

They are thankful for the support they have received in a very arduous undertaking; and they take this opportunity of acknowledging the great services of the Editors, whose learning has recommended the Series to Scholars, whilst their fairness and impartiality have been admitted by men of all shades of opinion.

Messrs. CLARK regret that they have received very little encouragement to publish the HOMILIES OF ORIGEN; but they are still open to the consideration of the matter if sufficient support can be obtained.

They trust that the Subscribers to the Ante-Nicene Series will continue their subscription to the WORKS OF ST. AUGUSTINE, of which four volumes are now ready, viz.:—

THE CITY OF GOD. In Two Volumes.
WRITINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE DONATIST CONTROVERSY. One Volume.
THE ANTI-PELAGIAN WRITINGS OF AUGUSTINE. Vol. I.

They are glad to announce as in contemplation a uniform translation of the WORKS OF CHRYSOSTOM.

ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY:

TRANSLATIONS OF

THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS

DOWN TO A.D. 325.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D.,

AND

JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D.

VOL. XXIII.

ORIGEN CONTRA CELSUM.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXII.

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . C. SCRIBNER AND CO.

THE WRITINGS

OF

ORIGEN.

TRANSLATED BY THE

REV. FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ST. ANDREWS.

VOLUME II.

ORIGEN CONTRA CELSUM,

BOOKS II.–VIII.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXII.

Books VII. and VIII. have been translated by the late W. H. CAIRNS, M.A., Rector of the Dumfries Academy, and the rest by PROFESSOR CROMBIE.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

PAGE

BOOK I., ... 393–478

PREFACE.—Origen undertakes this treatise at the desire of Ambrose, but thinks it unnecessary, as the facts and doctrines of Christianity form its best defence—work begun on one plan and carried on on another.

First objection of Celsus is, that Christians enter into secret associations, some of which are illegal,—his object being to discredit the "love-feasts" of the Christians: Answer of Origen—chap. i. Second objection of Celsus, that Judaism, on which Christianity depends, had a barbarous origin: Answer—chap. ii. Celsus objects that Christians practise their doctrines in secret to avoid the penalty of death: Answer—chap. iii. Morality of Christianity neither venerable nor new: Answer—chap. iv. Celsus approves of the views of Christians respecting idolatry, but asserts that these views are prior to Christianity: Answer—chap. v. Asserts that the miracles of Christianity were performed by means of the invocation of demons: Answer—chap. vi. That Christianity is a secret system of belief: Answer—chap. vii. Maintains that a man should die for his belief; inconsistency of this with his profession as an Epicurean—chap. viii. Maintains that reason ought to be the guide of men in adopting opinions, and charges Christians with inculcating a blind belief: Answer—chaps. ix.–xi. Boast of Celsus, that he is acquainted with all the opinions of the Christians, shown to be unfounded—chap. xii. Misrepresentation by Celsus of the statement in 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19: Correction and explanation—chap. xiii. Inconsistency of Celsus in accepting the accounts of Greeks and barbarians as to their antiquity, while rejecting the histories of the Jews—chaps. xiv.–xvi. Celsus objects to giving an allegorical signification to the Jewish history; inconsistency of this—chap. xvii. Challenges a comparison between the writings of Linus, Musæus, etc., and the laws of Moses: Answer—chap. xviii. Celsus holds that the world was uncreated, and yet is led to admit that it is comparatively modern—chaps. xix., xx. Celsus asserts that Moses borrowed his doctrines from wise nations and eloquent men, and thus obtained the reputation of divinity: Answer

PAGE

—chap. xxi. Circumcision, according to Celsus, first practised by the Egyptians: Answer—chap. xxii. The followers of Moses, shepherds and herdsmen, were led to believe in the unity of God through delusion and vulgar conceit: Answer—chap. xxiii. Various names given to the one God by the followers of Moses, all evincing their ignorance of His nature: Discussion regarding the significance of the divine names in various languages—chaps. xxiv., xxv. Celsus charges the Jews with worshipping angels and practising sorcery: Answer—chaps. xxvi., xxvii. Inconsistency of Celsus in introducing a Jew, as an opponent of Jesus, who does not maintain the character of a Jew throughout the discussion: This Jew represented as accusing Jesus of having "invented his birth from a virgin," and upbraiding Him with "being born in a certain Jewish village of a poor woman of the country who gained her subsistence by spinning, and who was turned out of doors by her husband, a carpenter by trade, because she was convicted of adultery; and after being driven away by her husband and wandering about for a time, she disgracefully gave birth to Jesus, an illegitimate child, who, having hired himself out as a servant in Egypt on account of his poverty, and having there acquired some miraculous powers, on which the Egyptians greatly pride themselves, returned to his own country, highly elated on account of them, and by help of them proclaimed himself a god"—chap. xxviii. Preliminary remarks to a full answer to these charges—chaps. xxix.–xxxii. Proof that the birth of Christ from a virgin was predicted by the prophets—chaps. xxxiii.–xxxv. Proof that prophets existed among the Jews—chap. xxxvi. Possibility of the miraculous birth of Christ—chap. xxxvii. Answer to the assertion that Jesus wrought His miracles by magic, and not by divine power—chap. xxxviii. Scoffs of Celsus regarding the mother of Jesus not deserving of answer—chap. xxxix. Celsus charges the narrative in Matthew regarding the dove which alighted upon the Saviour at His baptism with being fictitious; shows great want of method and order in the manner in which he brings his charges—chap. xl. Answer—chaps. xli.–xlviii. Celsus sets aside the fact that the coming of Jesus was predicted by the Jewish prophets, perhaps because he was not acquainted with the prophecies relating to Christ: Inconsistency of representing the Jew as saying, "My prophet once declared in Jerusalem that the Son of God will come as the judge of the righteous and the punisher of the wicked"—chaps. xlix., l. Detailed evidence from prophecy respecting the birth of Christ—chaps. li.–liii. Answer to objection of Celsus regarding the sufferings of Christ—chaps. liv.–lvi. Celsus asserts that every man, born according to the decree of divine Providence, is a son of God: Answer—chap. lvii. The Jew of Celsus goes on to misrepresent the Gospel account of the visit of the Magi, and of the slaughter of the innocents by Herod: Answer—chaps. lviii.–lxi.

PAGE

Calumnies of Celsus regarding the number and character and conduct of the disciples of Jesus: Answer—chaps. lxii.–lxv. The absurdity of the story of our Lord's removal when an infant, is, according to Celsus, a proof that He was not divine: Answer—chap. lxvi. Celsus denies that the works of Jesus were at all remarkable as compared with those attributed to Perseus and Amphion, and other mythological personages, but admits afterwards that some of them were remarkable,—such as His cures, and His resurrection, and the feeding of the multitude,—although he immediately afterwards compares them to the tricks of jugglers, and denies that they can furnish any proof of His being "Son of God:" Answer—chaps. lxvii., lxviii. Objection of Celsus that the body of Jesus could not have been that of a god, nor could be nourished with such food as Jesus partook of: Answer—chaps. lxix., lxx. Declares that opinions of Jesus were those of a wicked and God-hated sorcerer: Answer—chap. lxxi.

VOLUME II.

BOOK II., ... 1-84

This book contains Origen's answers to the charges which Celsus, in the person of a Jew, brings against the converts from Judaism to Christianity. Main charge is, that "they have forsaken the law of their fathers, in consequence of their minds being led captive by Jesus; that they have been most ridiculously deceived; and that they have become deserters to another name and to another mode of life." Answer to these charges—chap. i. Digression upon certain declarations of Jesus in the Gospels—chap. ii. Ignorance of Celsus evinced by the manner in which he represents the Jew as addressing the Israelitish converts—chap. iii. Objection of Jew, that Christianity takes its origin from Judaism, and that after a certain point it discards Judaism: Answer—chap. iv. Assertion of Celsus, that Jesus was punished by the Jews for His crimes, already answered—chap. v. Observance by Jesus of Jewish usages and sacrificial observances, no argument against His recognition as the Son of God—chap. vi. Language of Jesus furnishes not the slightest evidence, but the reverse, of arrogance: Quotations—chap. vii. Allegation, that when men are willing to be deceived, many persons like Jesus would find a friendly reception; inconsistency of this; various other charges disposed of—chap. viii. Assertion of Celsus, that Jesus could not be deemed a god because he was currently reported to have performed none of his promises, and, after conviction and sentence, was found attempting to conceal himself and endeavouring to escape, and was then betrayed by his disciples; impossibility of such things, according to Celsus, happening to a god: Answer to these calumnies and objections—chaps. ix.–xi. Assertion of Celsus,

PAGE

that Jesus was inferior to a brigand chief, because He was betrayed by His disciples: Answer—chap. xii. Celsus asserts that he omits mention of many things in the life of Christ which he could state to His disadvantage; challenged to produce such: Several predictions of Jesus quoted and commented on—chap. xiii. Celsus makes light of the admission that future events were predicted by Jesus: Remarks of Origen in answer—chap. xiv. Assertion of Celsus, that the disciples of Jesus devised the fiction that He foreknew everything before it happened: Answer—chap. xv. Asserts that the disciples wrote the accounts they have given by way of extenuating the charges against Him: Answer—chap. xvi. Celsus alleges that a prudent man—much more a god or spirit—would have tried to escape dangers that were foreseen, whereas Jesus did the reverse: Answer—chap. xvii. Objection of Celsus, that the announcements which Jesus made regarding those disciples who were to betray and deny Him had not the effect of deterring them from their treason and perjury, shown to be self-contradictory—chap. xviii. Further statement of Celsus, that in such cases intending criminals abandon their intentions, shown to be untrue—chap. xix. Objection, that if Jesus had been a God, His predictions must infallibly have come to pass; and assertion, that He plotted against the members of His own table: Refuted—chaps. xx.–xxii. Assertion, that the things which He suffered could have been neither painful nor distressing, because He submitted to them voluntarily and as a God—chap. xxiii. Misrepresentation of Celsus as to the language employed by Jesus during His sufferings—chaps. xxiv., xxv. Celsus charges the disciples with having invented statements: Answer—chap. xxvi. Alleges that Christian believers have corrupted the gospel in order to be able to reply to objections: Answer—chap. xxvii. The Jew of Celsus reproaches Christians with making use of the prophets: Answer—chap. xxviii. Assertion of Celsus, that from such signs and misinterpretations, and from proofs so mean, no one could prove Jesus to be God and the Son of God: Answer—chap. xxx. Charges Christians with sophistical reasoning in saying that the Son of God is the Logos Himself: Refutation—chap. xxxi. Objection of Celsus to our Lord's genealogy: Refutation—chap. xxxii. Celsus ridicules the actions of Jesus as unworthy of a God: Refutation—chap. xxxiii. Inconsistency of Celsus in representing the Jew as conversant with Greek literature; various remarks of Celsus answered—chap. xxxiv. Question of Celsus, why Jesus does not give some manifestation of His divinity by taking vengeance upon those who insult Him and His Father: Answered—chap. xxxv. Celsus scoffingly inquires, What was the nature of the ichor in the body of Jesus? and asserts that Jesus rushed with open mouth to drink of the vinegar and gall: Answer—chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii. Sneer of the Jew, that Christians find fault with Jews for not recognising Jesus as God: Answer—

PAGE

chap. xxxviii. Falsehood of the assertion of this Jew of Celsus, that Jesus gained over to His cause no one during His life, not even His own disciples—chap. xxxix. Jew goes on to assert that Jesus did not show Himself to be pure from all evil: Answer—chaps. xli., xlii. Falsity of the statement, that Jesus, after failing to gain over those who were in this world, went to Hades to gain over those who were there—chap. xliii. Celsus asserts further, that other individuals who have been condemned and died miserable deaths ought to be regarded as greater and more divine messengers of heaven than Jesus: Answer—chap. xliv. Argument of Celsus against the truth of Christianity, from the different behaviour of the actual followers of Jesus during His life and that of Christians at the present day: Answer—chap. xlv. Falsehood of the assertion, that Jesus when on earth gained over to Himself only sailors and tax-gatherers of the most worthless character—chap. xlvi. Answer to the question, By what train of argument were Christians led to regard Jesus as the Son of God?—chap. xlvii. Assertion of Celsus, that Jesus is deemed by Christians to be the Son of God because He healed the lame and the blind and is asserted to have raised the dead: Answer—chap. xlviii. Statement of Celsus, that Jesus convicted Himself of being a sorcerer: Refuted by His predictions regarding false prophets, etc.—chaps. xlix., l. No resemblance between the works of Jesus and those of a sorcerer—chap. li. Inconsistency of the Jew in raising the objections which he does, seeing that the same objections might be raised against the divinity of Mosaism—chaps. lii–liv. Jew objects further, that the predictions, although actually uttered, prove nothing, because many have been deceived by juggling tricks; asserts also, that there is no satisfactory evidence of the resurrection of Jesus, the report of which can be explained in other ways: Answer—chaps. lv.–lxii. Celsus proceeds to bring, as a serious charge against Jesus, that He did not appear after His resurrection to those who had ill-treated Him and condemned Him, and to men in general: Answer—chaps. lxiii–lxvii. Celsus asserts, that it would have helped to manifest His divinity if He had at once disappeared from the cross: Answer—chaps. lxviii., lxix. Inconsistency of Celsus' statement (that Jesus concealed Himself) with the facts of the case, pointed out—chap. lxx. Certain declarations of Jesus regarding Himself, noticed — chap. lxxi. Celsus asks why, if Jesus wished to remain hid, a voice was heard from heaven proclaiming Him to be the Son of God? or, if He did not seek concealment, why was He punished? or, why did He die? Answer—chap. lxxii. Celsus asserts, that no witness is needed to refute the statements of the Christians, because these are taken from their own books, which are self-contradictory: Answer—chap. lxxiv. Impossibility, according to Celsus, that a god, who was expected to appear among men, should be received with incredulity on his coming, or

PAGE

should fail to be recognised by those who have been looking for him: Answer—chap. lxxv. All objections brought by the Jew against Christianity might be retorted on himself: Illustrations—chap. lxxvi. Jew professes his belief in a bodily resurrection and in eternal life—chap. lxxvii. Asks if Jesus came into the world to produce unbelief in the minds of men: Answer—chap. lxxviii. Conclusion of the Jew is that everything proves Jesus to have been a man: General refutation.

BOOK III., ... 85–160

Object of Book Third to refute the charges which Celsus makes against Christianity in his own person. Assertion of Celsus that the controversy between Jews and Christians is most foolish; that there is nothing of importance in the investigations of Jews and Christians; because, although both believe that a Saviour was predicted, yet they do not agree on the point whether He has actually come or not. Refutation of these statements generally—chaps. i.–iv. Celsus alleges that both Judaism and Christianity originated in rebellion against the State; impossibility of this—chaps. v.–vii. Jews shown from their language not to be Egyptians—chap. viii. Falsehood of the assertion that Christians do not desire to convert all men, even if they could—chap. ix. Proof of Celsus in support of his assertion: Answer—chaps. x.–xiii. Union of Christians alleged to rest upon no substantial reason, save on rebellion and fear of external enemies: Answer—chaps. xiv., xv. Falsity of the charge that Christians invent terrors—chap. xvi. Comparison of the articles of the Christian faith to Egyptian temples, where, after passing through imposing avenues, nothing is found as an object of worship save a cat, or an ape, or a crocodile, or a goat, or a dog: Refutation of this—chaps. xvii.–xxi. Celsus asserts that the Dioscuri, and Hercules, and Æsculapius, and Dionysus, are believed by the Greeks to have become gods after being men; but that we refuse to recognise them as such, although they manifested many noble qualities, displayed for the benefit of mankind: General answer—chap. xxii. Comparison of our Lord's character with that of individuals referred to—chap. xxiii. Unfairness of Celsus in requiring Christians to believe the stories regarding such beings, and yet refusing his assent to the credibility of the Gospel narratives regarding Jesus—chap. xxiv. Examination of the case of Æsculapius—chaps. xxv., xxvi.; of Aristeas of Proconnesus—chaps. xxvi.–xxix. Superiority of the churches of God over the public assemblies—chaps. xxix., xxx. Comparison of the cases of Abaris the Hyperborean and of the Clazomenian with Jesus—chaps. xxxi., xxxii. Examination of the story of Cleomedes of Astypalea—chap. xxxiii. Celsus alleges that there are many other similar instances: This statement, even if true, shown to be inapplicable—chap. xxxiv. Celsus challenged to say whether he believes

PAGE

such beings really to be demons, or heroes, or gods: Consequences which will follow—chap. xxxv. Comparison of case of Antinous, the favourite of Hadrian, shown to be absurd—chaps. xxxvi.–xxxviii. Allegation of Celsus that faith alone leads Christians to give their assent to the doctrines of Jesus: Examination of this statement—chaps. xxxix.–xli. Comparison of mortal flesh of Jesus to gold, silver, or stone, shown to be inept—chap. xlii. Celsus asserts, that in ridiculing the worshippers of Jupiter, who was buried in Crete, while worshipping Jesus, who rose from the grave, we are guilty of inconsistency: Answer — chap. xliii. Various objections against Christianity, gathered from the more unintelligent Christians, adduced by Celsus; enumeration of these: Answers—chaps. xliv., xlv. Christians do desire that there should be wise men among them—chaps. xlv.–xlviii. Allegation that only the low, and the vile, and the ignorant, with women and children, are desired as converts, shown to be false in the sense in which it is advanced by Celsus—chaps. xlix.–liv. Charge brought against teachers of Christianity of surreptitiously inculcating their doctrines upon children without the knowledge of their parents—chap. lv. Examination of this charge—chaps. lvi.–lviii. Answer to charge of Celsus, that Christians invite the wicked alone to participation in their sacred rites—chaps. lix.–lxii. Refutation of the charge that God does not decide in accordance with truth, but with flattery—chap. lxiii. Answer to question of Celsus, why sinners are preferred over others—chap. lxiv. Falsehood of the assertion that Christians are able to gain over none but sinners—chap. lxv. Error of Celsus in denying the possibility of a complete transformation of character—chap. lxvi. His meaning probably was, that such transformation could not be effected by punishment; this shown to be false—chap. lxvii. Transformation of character, in certain cases, by means of philosophical discourses, not a matter to excite surprise: character of Christian preaching—chap. lxviii. Examination of Celsus' statement, that to change a nature entirely is exceedingly difficult—chap. lxix. God can do all that it is possible for Him to do without ceasing to be God—chap. lxx. Falsity of statement that God alleviates the sufferings of the wicked through pity for their wailings, but casts off the good—chap. lxxi. No truly wise man could be misled by any statements of an unintelligent Christian—chap. lxxii. Falsity of statements, that the ambassador of Christianity relates only ridiculous things—chap. lxxiii. That he seeks after the unintelligent alone—chap. lxxiv. That he acts like a person who promises to restore patients to bodily health, but who prevents them from consulting skilled physicians, who would expose his ignorance—chap. lxxv. That the Christian teacher acts like a drunken man, who should enter a company of drunkards, and accuse those who were sober of being drunk—chap. lxxvi. That he is like one suffering from ophthalmia, who should

PAGE

accuse the clear-sighted of blindness. Assertion of Celsus that Christians lead on men by empty hopes: Answer—chap. lxxvii. Character of those who become converts—chap. lxxviii. Christianity the best system which men were capable of receiving—chaps. lxxix.–lxxxi.

BOOK IV., ... 161–267

Subject of Fourth Book mainly to show that the prophecies regarding Christ are true predictions—chap. i. The position maintained by certain Christians, that there has already descended upon the earth a certain God, or Son of a God, who will make the inhabitants of the earth righteous, and by the Jews, that the advent of this being is still future, asserted by Celsus to be false: Answer—chap. ii. Question of Celsus as to the meaning of such a descent: Answered—chap. iii. Argument of Celsus turned against himself—chap. iv. Celsus misrepresents Christians as saying that God Himself will come down to men, and that it follows that He has left His own abode—chap. v. Celsus represents the object of God's descent to be a desire to make Himself known, and to make trial of men; and this, he alleges, testifies to an excessive and mortal ambition on the part of God: Answer—chaps. vi.–ix. Celsus asserts, that Christians talk of God in a way that is neither holy nor reverential, and likens them to those who in the Bacchic mysteries introduce phantoms and objects of terror: Answer—chap. x. Celsus endeavours to prove that the statements in the Christian records regarding floods and conflagrations are neither new nor wonderful, but may be paralleled and explained from the accounts of the Greeks: Answer—chaps. xi.–xiii. Celsus returns to the subject of the descent of God, alleging that if He came down among men, He must have undergone a change from better to worse, which is impossible in the case of an immortal being: Answer—chaps. xiv.–xvi. Superiority of the scriptural accounts of these matters over those of the Greek mythology—chap. xvii. Celsus repeats his objections: Answer—chaps. xviii., xix. Celsus' representation of the manner in which the Jews maintain that the advent of Jesus is still future—chap. xx. Absurdity of the statement of Celsus that the overturning of the tower of Babel had the same object as the Deluge, viz. the purification of the earth—chap. xxi. Proof that Jews brought on themselves the divine wrath, because of their treatment of Jesus—chap. xxii. Celsus insolently compares Jews and Christians to bats, and ants, and frogs, and worms, etc.—chap. xxiii. Answer—chaps. xxiv., xxv. Superiority of Christians in their opinions and practice to idolaters—chaps. xxvi., xxvii. Celsus misrepresents the language of Christians as to God's descent among men, and His intercourse with them—chaps. xxviii., xxix. Celsus, not understanding the words, "Let us make man in our image and likeness," has represented Christians as

PAGE

saying that they *resemble* God because created by Him: Answer—chap. xxx. Celsus again asserts that the Jews were fugitives from Egypt, who never performed anything of note, and were never held in any account: Answer—chaps. xxxi., xxxii. Celsus, in very ambiguous language, asserts that the Jews endeavoured to derive their origin from the first race of jugglers and deceivers, and appealed to the testimony of dark and ambiguous words: Answer—chaps. xxxiii.–xxxv. Celsus adduces instances of alleged great antiquity put forth by other nations, and asserts that the Jews wove together some most incredible and stupid stories, regarding the creation of man, the formation of the woman, the issuing of certain commands by God, the opposition of the serpent, and the defeat of God, who is thus shown to have been weak at the very beginning of things, and unable to persuade a single individual to obey His will: Detailed answers to these misrepresentations—chaps. xxxvi.–xl. Celsus next ridicules the accounts of the Deluge and the Ark: Answers—chaps. xli., xlii. Goes on to carp at the histories of Abraham and Sarah, of Cain and Abel, of Esau and Jacob, of Laban and Jacob—chap. xliii. Explanation of the statement that "God gave wells to the righteous;" other matters, also, to be allegorically understood—chap. xliv. Celsus does not recognise the love of truth which characterizes the writers of Scripture; figurative signification of Sodom, and of Lot and his daughters; discussion on the nature of actions—chap. xlv. Spirit of hostility which characterizes Celsus, in selecting from the narratives of Scripture whatever may serve as ground of accusation against Christians, while passing without notice whatever may redound to their credit: Instances—chap. xlvi. Celsus refers vaguely to the dreams of the butler and baker in the history of Joseph, and endeavours to find ground of objection in the history of Joseph's conduct towards his brethren—chap. xlvii. Asserts that the more modest among Jews and Christians endeavour to give these things an allegorical meaning, because they are ashamed of them: Answer—chap. xlviii. Falsity of his assertion that the scriptural writings are incapable of receiving an allegorical meaning—chaps. xlix., l. The treatises which give allegorical explanations of the law of Moses evidently unknown to Celsus, otherwise he could not have said that these allegorical explanations were more shameful than the fables themselves: Illustrations—chap. li. Celsus refers to the work entitled "Controversy between Papiscus and Jason," in support of his assertions—chaps. lii., liii. Celsus conceals his real opinions, although he ought to have avowed them, when quoting from the *Timæus* of Plato, to the effect that God made immortal things alone, while mortal things are the work of others; that the soul is the work of God, while the body is different; that there is no difference between the body of a man, and that of a bat: Examination of these statements—chaps. liv.–lix. Asserts that a common

PAGE

nature pervades all bodies, and that no product of matter is immortal: Answers—chaps. lx., lxi. Maintains that the amount of evil is a fixed quantity, which has never varied: Answers—chaps. lxii.-lxiv. That it is difficult for any but a philosopher to ascertain the origin of evils, but that it is sufficient for the multitude to say that they do not proceed from God, but cleave to matter; and that, as the cause of mortal events never varies, the same things must always return, according to the appointed cycles: Answers—chaps. lxv.-lxix. Assertion of Celsus that a thing which seems to be evil may not necessarily be so: Examined—chap. lxx. Celsus misunderstands the anthropopathic language of Scripture: Explanation—chaps. lxxi.-lxxiii. Celsus finds fault with Christians for asserting that God made all things for the sake of man, whereas they were made as much for the sake of the irrational animals: Answer—chap. lxxiv. Celsus holds that thunders, and lightnings, and rains are not the works of God; that even if they were, they were brought into existence as much for the sake of plants, and trees, and herbs, as for that of human beings: Answer—chaps. lxxv., lxxvi. Celsus maintains that the verse of Euripides, viz. "The sun and night are to mortals slaves," is untrue, as these luminaries may be said to be created for the use of ants and flies as much as of man: Answer—chap. lxxvii. Asserts that we may be said to be created as much on account of irrational animals as they on our account: Answer—chaps. lxxviii.-lxxx. Celsus maintains that the superiority of man over irrational animals in building cities and founding political communities is only apparent: Examination of this assertion—chaps. lxxxi.-lxxxiv. No great difference, according to Celsus, between the actions of men, and those of ants and bees—chap. lxxxv. Certain irrational animals, according to Celsus, possess the power of sorcery; instances: Examination of these—chaps. lxxxvi., lxxxvii. Assertion that the thoughts entertained of God by irrational animals are not inferior to those of men; illustrations: Answer—chaps. lxxxviii., lxxxix. Degrading views of Celsus—chaps. xc.-xcix.

BOOK V., ... 268-335

Continuation of the subject—chap. i. Celsus repeats his denial that no God, or son of God, has either come, or will come, to earth; that if certain angels did come, by what name are they to be called? whether by that of gods or some other race of beings? in all probability such angels were demons: Refutation—chaps. ii.-v. Celsus proceeds to express surprise that the Jews should worship heaven and angels, and yet pass by the heavenly bodies, as the sun and moon; which procedure is, according to his view, most unreasonable: Refutation—chaps. vi.-x. Defence of Christians against the same charge—chaps. x.-xiii. Celsus declares the Christian belief in the future conflagration of the world, in the salvation of the

PAGE

righteous, in the resurrection of the body, most foolish and irrational, alleging that this belief is not held by some of the Christian believers, and adducing certain considerations regarding the character of God and the nature of bodies which render such things impossible—chap. xiv. Refutation in detail of these objections—chaps. xv.–xxiv. Examination of Celsus' statement that the various quarters of the earth were from the beginning allotted to different superintending spirits, and that in this way the administration of the world is carried on—chaps. xxv.–xxviii. Considerations of a profounder kind may be stated regarding the original distribution of the various quarters of the earth among different superintending spirits, which considerations may be shown to be free from the absurd consequences which would follow from the views of Celsus; enumeration of these—chaps. xxix.–xxxiii. Statement of Celsus regarding the request of the people of Marea and Apis to the oracle of Ammon, as related by Herodotus, and the inference which he seems to draw from it and other similar instances adduced by him, examined and refuted—chaps. xxxiv.–xxxix. Examination of Celsus' quotation from Pindar, that "Law is king of all things"—chap. xl. Celsus goes on to state objections which apply to Jews much more than to Christians, viz. that the Jewish doctrine regarding heaven is not peculiar to them, but has long ago been received by the Persians; and proceeds to observe that it makes no difference by what name the Supreme Being is called; nor are the Jews to be deemed holier than other nations because abstaining from swine's flesh, etc. Detailed examination and refutation of these statements—chaps. xli.–xlix. Celsus denies that the Jews were regarded by God with greater favour than other nations: Answer—chap. l. Statement of Celsus that, admitting Jesus to have been an angel, He was not the first who came to visit men, for the histories relate that there have been many instances, several of which he enumerates—chap. lii. Refutation—chaps. liii.–lviii. Conclusion of Celsus that Jews and Christians have the same God, and that the latter adopt the Jewish accounts regarding the six days; other points of agreement mentioned: examination of these statements, as well as of his admission that certain Christians will admit the identity, while others will deny it—chaps. lix.–lxii. Argument of Celsus against Christianity, founded upon the existence of those who have worshipped demons as their teacher, and of sects that have hated each other, examined and refuted—chap. lxiii. Celsus has misunderstood the prediction of the apostle that deceivers will come in the last times—chap. lxiv. Falsity of Celsus' statement that all who differ so widely may be heard saying, "The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world"—chap. lxv.

BOOK VI., ... 336–424

Object of Sixth Book specially to refute those objections which

PAGE

Celsus brings against Christians, and not those derived from writers on philosophy—chap. i. Explanation of the reasons which led the writers of Scripture to adopt a simple style of address—chap. ii. Quotation from Plato regarding the "chief good," and remarks upon it—chap. iii. Inconsistent conduct of those who can so express themselves pointed out—chap. iv. Comparison of the Platonic phraseology, regarding the kindling of a light in the soul, with the language of Scripture—chap. v. Examination of the question whether Plato was acquainted with doctrines more profound than those which are contained in his writings, and demonstration of the fact that the prophets did know of greater things than any in Scripture, but did not commit them to writing—chaps. vi.–x. Celsus inquires whether, amid the perplexity arising from the existence of different Christs, men are to cast the dice to divine which of them they ought to follow? Answer—chap. xi. Perversion of the language of Paul regarding wisdom corrected—chaps. xii., xiii. Examination of Celsus' charge that Christians are uninstructed, servile, and ignorant—chap. xiv. Sneer of Celsus at the humility of Christians answered—chap. xv. Celsus charges Jesus with having perverted the language of Plato in His saying regarding the impossibility of a rich man's entering the kingdom of heaven: Answer—chap. xvi. Comparison of some points of Scripture doctrine with statements of Plato—chaps. xvii., xviii. Charge of Celsus that Christians have misunderstood language of Plato, in boasting of a "super-celestial" God: Answer—chap. xix. Explanation of certain terms referring to heaven—chaps. xx., xxi. Assertion of Celsus, that the Persian mysteries of Mithras contain many obscure allusions to those heavenly things mentioned in the Christian writings; absurdity of his statements—chaps. xxii., xxiii. Celsus refers to a certain diagram, the statements regarding which he appears to have borrowed from the sect of the Ophites; which statements, however, are of no credibility —chap. xxiv. Description of said diagram, and explanation of the names inscribed in it—chaps. xxv., xxvi. Certain statements of Celsus regarding the "seal" examined—chap. xxvii. Celsus asserts that Christians term the Creator an "accursed" divinity, and asks what could be more foolish or insane than such senseless wisdom? Examination of these statements—chaps. xxviii., xxix. Celsus returns to the subject of the seven ruling demons, and makes reference to the diagram—chap. xxx. Quotations illustrating the manner of invoking said demons—chap. xxxi. Remarks on the procedure of Celsus—chap. xxxii. Further statements of Celsus—chap. xxxiii. Continuation of statements of Celsus, to the effect that Christians heap together one thing after another,—discourses of prophets, circles upon circles, effluents from an earthly church, and from circumcision; and a power flowing from one Prunicos, a virgin and living soul; and a heaven slain in order to live, etc. etc.—chap. xxxiv.

PAGE

Detailed examination and answer to these statements—chaps. xxxv.–xxxvii. Celsus introduces other charges, stating that there are inscriptions in the diagram containing two words, "a greater and a less," which are referred to Father and Son: Answer—chap. xxxviii. Statement of Celsus, that names of demons among the Greeks are different from what they are among the Scythians; gives illustrations: Answer—chap. xxxix. Statement of Celsus, on the authority of Dionysius, an Egyptian magician, that magic arts have no power over philosophers, but only over uneducated men and persons of corrupt morals: Falsity of this shown—chap. xli. Allegation of Celsus, that Christians have invented the fiction of the devil or Satan, as an adversary to God, who counterworks His plans and defeats them; that the Son of God, even, has been vanquished by the devil; and that the devil will exhibit great and marvellous works, and claim for himself the glory of God: Examination and refutation of these statements — chaps. xlii. – xliv. Celsus has misunderstood the statements of Scripture regarding Antichrist: Explanation of these—chaps. xlv., xlvi. Celsus perverts the language of Christians regarding the "Son of God:" Answer—chap. xlvii. Mystical meaning of "Son of God" explained—chap. xlviii. Celsus characterizes the Mosaic cosmogony as extremely silly, and alleges that Moses and the prophets, from ignorance, have woven together a web of sheer nonsense: Answers—chaps. xlix.–li. Celsus will not decide whether the world was uncreated and indestructible, or created but not destructible—chap. lii. Brings forward objections that were raised against Marcion, and after several disparaging observations on the manner of the divine procedure towards men, asks how it is that God created evil, etc.—chap. liii. Answer to the foregoing—chaps. liv.–lix. Celsus repeats charges formerly made regarding the days of creation—chaps. lx., lxi. Comments on the expression, "The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it:" Answer—chap. lxii. Asserts that "the first-born of every creature" is the image of God, and that God did not make man in His image, because he is unlike to any other species of being; explanation of the expression, "Man is made after the image of God"—chap. lxiii. God partakes neither of form nor colour, nor can motion be predicated of Him; explanation of passages that seem to imply the reverse —chap. lxiv. Inconsistency of Celsus with his declared opinions, in saying that God is the source of all things; asserts that He cannot be reached by word: Explanation and distinction—chap. lxv. Celsus asks, in the person of another, how it is possible to know God, or to learn the way that leads to Him, because darkness is thrown before the eyes, and nothing distinctly seen: Answer to this query, and remark of Celsus retorted upon himself—chaps. lxvi.–lxviii. Celsus represents our answer as being this: "Since God is great and difficult to see, He put His own Spirit into a body that resem-

PAGE

bled ours, and sent it down to us, that we might be enabled to hear Him, and become acquainted with Him:" Examination of this statement—chaps. lxix., lxx. According to Celsus, our doctrine regarding the spirit is the same as that of the Stoics, who maintain that "God is a spirit, diffused through all things, and containing all things within Himself:" Answer—chap. lxxi. Assertion that the Son of God would not be immortal, because He was a spirit existing in a human body: Answer—chap. lxxii. Criticises, in scoffing language, the incarnation; exposure of his errors—chap. lxxiii. Returns to the subject of Marcion's opinions; introduces "two sons of God," and speaks scoffingly of the supposed controversies between them—chap. lxxiv. Maintains that the body of Jesus must have been different from that of other beings, in virtue of His divine qualities. Consideration of the prophecies regarding Jesus: Answers to his statements—chaps. lxxv.–lxxvii. Celsus ridicules the sending of God's Spirit into *one* corner of the world alone, and compares God to Jupiter in the comedy, who sent Mercury to the Athenians and Lacedemonians: Answer—chaps. lxxviii., lxxix. Celsus terms the Chaldeans a divinely-inspired nation; speaks of the Egyptian people as also inspired, although he condemned them formerly, and refuses this title to the Jews; inconsistency of all this—chap. lxxx. Pretends not to understand how God could send His Son amongst wicked men, who were to inflict punishment upon Him: Answer—chap. lxxxi.

BOOK VII., ... 425–491

Celsus denies that the Jewish prophets predicted any of the events which occurred in the life of Christ, and asserts that those who believe in the existence of another God, besides that of the Jews, cannot refute his objections; while Christians, who recognise the God of the Jews, rely for their defence on the alleged predictions regarding Christ: Remarks—chap. ii. Celsus declares Christians inconsistent in rejecting the ancient Grecian oracles of Delphi, Dodona, Clarus, Branchidæ, Jupiter Ammon, etc., which nevertheless were of high importance, while insisting that the sayings uttered in Judea are marvellous and unchangeably true: Detailed answer to this objection—chaps. iii.–viii. Asserts that many individuals assume the attitude of inspiration, and claim to be God, or the Son of God, or the divine Spirit, and to have come down to save a perishing world, and promise rewards to those who do them homage, and threaten vengeance upon others; and, moreover, to these promises add strange and unintelligible words, which may be applied by any impostor to his own purposes—chap. ix. Answer to these charges—chaps. x.–xii. Falsity of Celsus' statement that God favours the commission of evil—chap. xiii. Celsus objects, that even if the prophets foretold that the great God would become a slave, or die,

PAGE

there was no necessity that He should do so simply because such things had been predicted: Answers—chaps. xiv.–xvii. Celsus objects further, that if the prophets of the God of the Jews foretold that Jesus was to be the Son of the same God, how could commands have been given through Moses that the Jews should accumulate wealth, extend their dominion, fill the earth, put their enemies to the sword, under threat of being treated by God as His enemies; whilst the man of Nazareth, His Son, delivered commands of a totally opposite kind? Errors of Celsus pointed out in detail, and the nature of the two dispensations explained—chaps. xviii.–xxvi. Falsity of assertion that Christians believe the Divine Being to be corporeal in His nature, and to possess a body like a man—chap. xxvii. Celsus alleges that the idea of a better land than this, to which Christians hope to go after death, has been borrowed from the divine men of a former age, and quotes from Homer and Plato in support of his assertion: Answers—chaps. xxviii.–xxxi. Celsus next assails the doctrine of the resurrection, and asserts that we uphold this doctrine in order that we may see and know God: Answer—chaps. xxxii.–xxxiv. The oracles of Trophonius, etc., to which Celsus would direct Christians, assuring them that there they would see God distinctly, shown to be demons—chap. xxxv. Language of Christians as to the manner in which they see God misrepresented by Celsus—chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. Language of Celsus quite inappropriate as addressed to Christians, and applicable only to those whose doctrines differ widely from theirs—chap. xl. Celsus recommends Christians to follow the guidance of divinely inspired poets, wise men, and philosophers, without mentioning their names: Remarks on this—chap. xli. Proceeds to name Plato as an effective teacher of theological truth, quoting from the *Timæus* to the effect that it is a hard matter to find out the Maker and Father of the universe, and an impossibility to make Him known to all after having found Him; and remarking that Christians cannot follow the example of Plato and others, who proceed by analysis and synthesis, because they are wedded to the flesh: Answers—chaps. xlii.–xlv. General remarks upon the tone in which Christians carry on controversy with their opponents—chap. xlvi. Actions of those who, although seeming to be wise, did not yield themselves to the divine teaching—chap. xlvii. Purity of life exhibited by Christians—chap. xlviii. Even by those who are unable to investigate the deeper questions of theology —chap. xlix. Explanation of certain scriptural expressions regarding "birth" or "generation"—chap. l. Difference between Christians and those who received a portion of the divine Spirit before the dispensation of Christianity—chap. li. Celsus proceeds to say to Christians that they would have done better to have selected as the object of their homage some one who had died a glorious death, whose divinity might have received the support of

PAGE

some myth to perpetuate his memory, and names Hercules, Æsculapius, Anaxarchus, and Epictetus, as instances, alleging that Jesus never uttered under suffering any words that could be compared to their utterances—chap. liii. Answers—chaps. liv.-lv. Sneering remark of Celsus that we might better have given the name of Son of God to the Sibyl than to Jesus—chap. lvi. Scoffing advice of Celsus, that we had better choose Jonah than Jesus for our God: Answer—chap. lvii. Celsus asserts that the Christian precept, "Whosoever shall strike thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also," is an ancient saying, admirably expressed long ago, and reported by Christians in a coarser way, and quotes from Plato in support of his statement: Answer—chaps. lviii.-lxi. Celsus goes on to say that Christians cannot tolerate temples, altars, or images, and that in this peculiarity they resemble Scythians and other barbarous nations, adducing quotations from Herodotus and Heraclitus in support of his opinion that none, save those who are utterly childish, can take these things for gods—chap. lxii. Detailed answer—chaps. lxiii.-lxvi. Celsus remarks that Christians will not admit that these images are erected in honour of certain beings who are gods, but maintain that these are demons, and ought not to be worshipped: Remarks in answer—chap. lxvii. Asks why demons are not to be worshipped, and asserts that everything, whether the work of angels, demons, or heroes, is part of the providential government of the Most High God: Answers—chaps. lxviii.-lxx.

BOOK VIII., ... 492-559

Celsus, after his question regarding the worship of demons, proceeds to represent us as saying that it is impossible to serve many masters, and remarks that this is the language of sedition, and used only by those who stand aloof from all human society, etc. Consideration of the true language of Scripture upon this and kindred points, in answer to this statement—chaps. ii.-viii. Reckless language of Celsus, who would have us believe that we are led by our worship of God to that of other things which belong to God, without injury to ourselves, and who yet adds, "We may honour none except those to whom that right has been given by God:" Remarks—chap. ix. Nature of the honour which Christians pay to the Son of God—chap. x. Celsus asserts that those who uphold the unity of God are guilty of impiety: Answer—chap. xi. That if Christians worshipped one God alone, they would have valid arguments against the worship of others, but they pay excessive reverence to one who is the servant of God: Refutation—chaps. xii.-xiv. Celsus quotes from the opinions of some obscure heretical sect, contained in what is called a *Heavenly Dialogue*, to the effect that we suppose another God, who is above the heavens, to be the father of Him whom we honour, in order that we may honour the Son of Man alone; whom

PAGE

also we assert to be stronger than God, who rules the world and who rules over them: Answers—chaps. xv.–xvi. Celsus goes on to say, that our shrinking from raising altars, statues, and temples, has been agreed upon among us as the badge of a secret society: Answer—chaps. xvii.–xx. Assertion of Celsus, that those devoted to the service of God may take part in public feasts or idol offerings: Answer—chap. xxi. Answer to objection that Christians themselves observe certain days, as the Preparation, the Passover, and Pentecost——chaps. xxii., xxiii. Reasons urged by Celsus why Christians may make use of idol offerings and public sacrifices at public feasts; examination of these—chaps. xxiv.–xxvii. Celsus proceeds to state that if Christians abstain from idol offerings, they ought, in consistency, to abstain from all animal food, like the Pythagoreans: Answer—chaps. xxviii.–xxxii. Celsus alleges that if we come into the world at all, we must give thanks, and first-fruits, and prayers to demons, that they may prove good and kind: Answer—chaps. xxxiii., xxxiv. Celsus remarks that the satraps of a Persian or Roman monarch could do great injury to those who despised them, and asks, will the satraps and ministers of air and earth be insulted with impunity? Answer—chaps. xxxv., xxxvi. Asserts that if Christians invoke those whom they address by barbarous names they will have power, but not if invoked in Latin and Greek; falsity and absurdity of this statement—chap. xxxvii. Misrepresents the language addressed by Christians to the Grecian statues—chap. xxxviii. Scoffing language of Celsus to the Christians on the rejection of Jesus, whom he terms a demon, and on his inability to save His followers from being put to death—chap. xxxix. Contrast between the Christian and heathen doctrine of punishment—chap. xl. Railing address of Celsus, to the effect that although Christians may revile the statues of the gods, they would not have reviled the gods themselves with impunity; that nothing happened to those who crucified Jesus; that no father was ever so inhuman as was the father of Jesus, etc. etc.: Answers—chaps. xli.–xliv. Celsus asserts that it is of no use to collect all the oracular responses that have been delivered, for the world is full of them, and many remarkable events have happened in consequence of them, which establish their reality and divinity; general remark in answer—chap. xlv. Contrast between conduct of Pythian priestess, who frequently allowed herself to be bribed, and that of the prophets, who were admired for their downright truthfulness—chap. xlvi. Assertion of Greeks, that the Jewish history contains fabulous accounts, refuted—chap. xlvii. Endeavour of Celsus to show that the doctrines delivered at the celebration of the pagan mysteries are the same as those of the Christians; absurdity of this—chap. xlviii. Celsus reproaches Christians with inconsistency in their treatment of the body: Answer—chaps. xlix., l. Celsus approves the Christian doctrine that the righteous

PAGE

shall enjoy everlasting life, and the wicked shall suffer everlasting punishment; inconsistency of this on the part of Celsus—chap. li. Anxiety of Origen to bring all men to receive the whole system of Christian truth—chap. lii. Doubtful manner in which Celsus speaks of certain weighty matters, and reluctance on his part to set down any of them as false; inconsistency of this with the manner in which he treats the doctrines of Christianity, which he regards with a hostile spirit—chaps. liii., liv. Celsus asserts that Christians must make their choice between two alternatives; nature of these: Answer—chaps. lv.–lvii. Seeks to degrade the souls of men to the worship of demons, by referring to certain practices and beliefs prevalent among the Egyptians: Answer—chaps. lviii.–lix. Admits that there is a dangerous tendency in demon-worship: Remarks—chaps. lx.–lxii. Yet adds that the more just opinion is that demons desire and need nothing, but that they take pleasure in those who discharge towards them offices of piety: Answer—chaps. lxiii.–lxv. Celsus admits that no worshipper of God should submit to anything base, but should encounter any torments or death, rather than do anything unworthy of God; and yet to celebrate the sun, or the praises of Minerva, is only to render higher praise to God; inconsistency of this—chaps. lxvi., lxvii. Maintains that the Homeric saying must be observed, "Let one be king, whom the son of crafty Saturn appointed;" sense in which this must be understood by Christians—chap. lxviii. Inconsistency on the part of Celsus, after what he has said, in asking whether God would fight for the Romans, if they were to become converts to the worship of the Most High—chaps. lxix., lxx. Further misrepresentations of Celsus pointed out—chap. lxxi. Time will come when the Word will change every soul into His own perfections—chap. lxxii. Celsus enjoins us to help the king with all our might, and, if required, to fight under him, or lead an army along with him: Answer—chap. lxxiii. Also to take office in the government of the country, if necessary for the maintenance of the laws and the support of religion: Answer—chap. lxxv. Conclusion, in which Origen mentions that Celsus had announced his intention of writing a second treatise, which Origen requests Ambrose to send him if he should have carried his intentions into execution.

LIFE OF ORIGEN.

ORIGEN was born in all probability at Alexandria, about the year 185 A.D.[1] Notwithstanding that his name is derived from that of an Egyptian deity (Horus or Or[2]), there seems no reason to doubt that his parents were Christian at the time of his birth. His father Leonides was probably, as has been conjectured,[3] one of the many teachers of rhetoric or grammar who abounded in that city of Grecian culture, and appears to have been a man of decided piety. Under his superintendence, the youthful Origen was not only educated in the various branches of Grecian learning, but was also required daily to commit to memory and to repeat portions of Scripture prescribed him by his father; and while under this training, the spirit of inquiry into the meaning of Scripture, which afterwards formed so striking a feature in the literary character of the great Alexandrine, began to display itself. Eusebius[4] relates that he was not satisfied with the plain and obvious meaning of the text, but sought to penetrate into its deeper signification, and caused his father trouble by the questions which he put to him regarding the sense of particular passages of Holy Writ. Leonides, like many parents, assumed the appearance of rebuking the curiosity of the boy for inquiring into things which were beyond his youthful capacity, and recommended him to be satisfied with the simple and apparent meaning of Scripture, while he is

[1] Cf. Redepenning's *Origenes*, vol. i. pp. 417–420 (Erste Beilage: über Origenes Geburtsjahr und den Ort, wo er geboren wurde).

[2] Cf. *Ibid.* (Zweite Beilage: über Namen und Beinamen der Origenes).

[3] *Encyclopaedie der Katholischen Theologie*, s.v. Origenes.

[4] *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. ii. § 9.

described as inwardly rejoicing at the signs of talent exhibited by his son, and as giving thanks to God for having made him the parent of such a child.[1] But this state of things was not to last; for in the year 202, when Origen was about seventeen years of age, the great persecution of the Christians under Septimius Severus broke out, and among the victims was his father Leonides, who was apprehended and put in prison. Origen wished to share the fate of his father, but was prevented from quitting his home by the artifice of his mother, who was obliged to conceal his clothes to prevent him from carrying out his purpose! He wrote to his father, however, a letter, exhorting him to constancy under his trials, and entreating him not to change his convictions for the sake of his family.[2] By the death of his father, whose property was confiscated to the imperial treasury, Origen was left, with his mother and six younger brothers dependent upon him for support. At this juncture, a wealthy and benevolent lady of Alexandria opened to him her house, of which he became an inmate for a short time. The society, however, which he found there was far from agreeable to the feelings of the youth. The lady had adopted as her son one Paul of Antioch, whom Eusebius terms an "advocate of the heretics then existing at Alexandria." The eloquence of the man drew crowds to hear him, although Origen could never be induced to regard him with any favour, nor even to join with him in any act of worship, giving then, as Eusebius remarks, "unmistakeable specimens of the orthodoxy of his faith." [3]

Finding his position in this household so uncomfortable, he resolved to enter upon the career of a teacher of grammar, and to support himself by his own exertions. As he had been carefully instructed by his father in Grecian literature, and had devoted himself to study after his death, he was enabled successfully to carry out his intention. And now begins the second stadium of his career.

The diligence and ability with which Origen prosecuted his profession speedily attracted attention and brought him many

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. ii. §§ 10, 11.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. ii.: Ἔπεχε, μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς ἄλλο τι φρονήσῃς.

[3] τῆς ἐξ ἐκείνου περὶ τὴν πίστιν ὀρθοδοξίας ἐναργῆ παρείχετο δείγματα.

pupils. Among others who sought to avail themselves of his instructions in the principles of the Christian religion, were two young men, who afterwards became distinguished in the history of the Church,—Plutarch, who died the death of martyrdom, and Heraclas, who afterwards became bishop of Alexandria. It was not, however, merely by his success as a teacher that Origen gained a reputation. The brotherly kindness and unwearied affection which he displayed to all the victims of the persecution, which at that time was raging with peculiar severity at Alexandria under the prefect Aquila, and in which many of his old pupils and friends were martyred, are described as being so marked and conspicuous, as to draw down upon him the fury of the mob, so that he was obliged on several occasions to flee from house to house to escape instant death. It is easy to understand that services of this kind could not fail to attract the attention of the heads of the Christian community at Alexandria; and partly, no doubt, because of these, but chiefly on account of his high literary reputation, Bishop Demetrius appointed him to the office of master in the Catechetical School, which was at that time vacant (by the departure of Clement, who had quitted the city on the outbreak of the persecution), although he was still a layman, and had not passed his eighteenth year. The choice of Demetrius was amply justified by the result. Origen discontinued his instructions in literature, in order to devote himself exclusively to the work of teaching in the Catechetical School. For his labours he refused all remuneration. He sold the books which he possessed,—many of them manuscripts which he himself had copied,—on condition of receiving from the purchaser four obols[1] a day; and on this scanty pittance he subsisted, leading for many years a life of the greatest asceticism and devotion to study. After a day of labour in the school, he used to devote the greater part of the night to the investigation of Scripture, sleeping on the bare ground, and keeping frequent fasts. He carried out literally the command of the Saviour, not to possess two coats, or to wear shoes, and consummated his work of mortification of the flesh by an act of self-mutilation, springing from a perverted interpretation of our Lord's words in Matt. xix. 12, and under-

[1] The obol was about three-halfpence of our money.

taken from a desire to place himself beyond the reach of temptation in the intercourse which he necessarily had to hold with his youthful female catechumens.[1] This act was destined to exercise a baneful influence upon his future fortunes in the Church.

During the episcopate of Zephyrinus (201–218) Origen visited Rome, and on his return again resumed his duties in the Catechetical School, transferring the care of the younger catechumens to his friend and former pupil Heraclas, that he might devote himself with less distraction to the instruction of the more advanced, and to the more thorough investigation and exposition of Scripture. With a view to accomplish this more successfully, it is probable that about this time he set himself to acquire a knowledge of the Hebrew language, the fruit of which may be seen in the fragments which remain to us of his *magnum opus*, the *Hexapla;* and as many among the more cultured heathens, attracted by his reputation, seem to have attended his lectures, he felt it necessary to make himself more extensively acquainted with the doctrines of the Grecian schools, that he might meet his opponents upon their own ground, and for this purpose he attended the prelections of Ammonius Saccas, at that time in high repute at Alexandria as an expounder of the Neo-Platonic philosophy, of which school he has generally been considered the founder. The influence which the study of philosophical speculations exerted upon the mind of Origen may be traced in the whole course of his after development, and proved the fruitful source of many of those errors which were afterwards laid to his charge, and the controversies arising out of which disturbed the peace of the Church during the two following centuries. As was to be expected, the fame of the great Alexandrine teacher was not confined to his native city, but spread far and wide; and an evidence of this was the request made by the Roman governor of the province of Arabia to Demetrius and to the prefect of Egypt, that they would send Origen to him that he might hold an interview with one whose

[1] For a full discussion of the doubts which have been thrown upon the credibility of Eusebius in this matter by Schnitzer and Baur, cf. Redepenning, *Origenes*, vol. i. pp. 444–458, and Hefele, *Encyclopaedie der Katholischen Theologie*, s.v. Origenes.

reputation was so great. We have no details of this visit, for all that Eusebius relates is that, "having accomplished the objects of his journey, he again returned to Alexandria."[1] It was in the year 216 that the Emperor Caracalla visited Alexandria, and directed a bloody persecution against its inhabitants, especially the literary members of the community, in revenge for the sarcastic verses which had been composed against him for the murder of his brother Geta, a crime which he had perpetrated under circumstances of the basest treachery and cruelty.

Origen occupied too prominent a position in the literary society of the city to be able to remain with safety, and therefore withdrew to Palestine to his friend Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem, and afterwards to Cæsarea, where he received an honourable welcome from Bishop Theoctistus. This step proved the beginning of his after troubles. These two men, filled with becoming admiration for the most learned teacher in the Church, requested him to expound the Scriptures in their presence in a public assembly of the Christians. Origen, although still a layman, and without any sacerdotal dignity in the Church, complied with the request. When this proceeding reached the ears of Demetrius, he was filled with the utmost indignation. "Such an act was never either heard or done before, that laymen should deliver discourses in the presence of the bishops,"[2] was his indignant remonstrance to the two offending bishops, and Origen received a command to return immediately to Alexandria. He obeyed, and for some years appears to have devoted himself solely to his studies in his usual spirit of self-abnegation.

It was probably during this period that the commencement of his friendship with Ambrosius is to be dated. Little is known of this individual. Eusebius[3] states that he had formerly been an adherent of the Valentinian heresy, but had been converted by the arguments and eloquence of Origen to the orthodox faith of the Church. They became intimate friends; and as Ambrose seems to have been possessed of large means, and entertained an unbounded admiration of the learning and abilities of his friend, it was his delight to bear the expenses attending the transcription and publication of the many works which he persuaded him

[1] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 19, § 16.
[2] *Ibid.* b. vi. c. 19.
[3] *Ibid.* b. vi. c. 18.

to give to the world. He furnished him "with more than seven amanuenses, who relieved each other at stated times, and with an equal number of transcribers, along with young girls who had been practised in caligraphy,"[1] to make fair copies for publication of the works dictated by Origen. The literary activity of these years must have been prodigious, and probably they were among the happiest which Origen ever enjoyed. Engaged in his favourite studies, surrounded by many friends, adding yearly to his own stores of learning, and enriching the literature of the Church with treatises of the highest value in the department of sacred criticism and exegesis, it is difficult to conceive a condition of things more congenial to the mind of a true scholar. Only one incident of any importance seems to have taken place during these peaceful years,—his visit to Julia Mammæa, the pious mother of Alexander Severus. This noble lady had heard of the fame of Origen, and invited him to visit her at Antioch, sending a military escort to conduct him from Alexandria to the Syrian capital. He remained with her some time, "exhibiting innumerable illustrations of the glory of the Lord, and of the excellence of divine instruction, and then hastened back to his accustomed studies."[2]

These happy years, however, were soon to end. Origen was called to Greece, probably about the year 228,[3] upon what Eusebius vaguely calls "the pressing need of ecclesiastical affairs,"[4] but which has generally been understood[5] to refer to the prevalence of heretical views in the Church there, for the eradication of which the assistance of Origen was invoked. Before entering on this journey, he obtained letters of recommendation from his bishop.[6] He passed through Palestine on his way to Greece, and at Cæsarea received at the hands of his friends Alexander and Theoctistus the consecration to the office of presbyter,—an honour which proved to him afterwards

[1] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 23.

[2] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 21: *παρ' ἣ χρόνον διατρίψας, πλεῖστά τε ὅσα εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου διδασκαλείου ἀρετῆς ἐπιδειξάμενος, ἐπὶ τὰς συνήθεις ἔσπευδε διατριβάς.*

[3] Cf. Hefele, *Encyclopaedie*, etc., *s.v.* Origenes.

[4] *Ἐπειγούσης χρείας ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἕνεκα πραγμάτων.*

[5] Cf. Redepenning, vol. i. p. 406, etc.

[6] Cf. *ibid.*

the source of much persecution and annoyance. No doubt the motives of his friends were of the highest kind, and among them may have been the desire to take away the ground of objection formerly raised by Demetrius against the public preaching of a mere layman in the presence of a bishop. But they little dreamed of the storm which this act of theirs was to raise, and of the consequences which it was to bring upon the head of him whom they had sought to honour. After completing his journey through Greece, Origen returned to Alexandria about the year 230. He there found his bishop greatly incensed against him for what had taken place at Cæsarea. Nor did his anger expend itself in mere objurgations and rebukes. In the year 231 a synod was summoned by Demetrius, composed of Egyptian bishops and Alexandrian presbyters, who declared Origen unworthy to hold the office of teacher, and excommunicated him from the fellowship of the church of Alexandria. Even this did not satisfy the vindictive feeling of Demetrius. He summoned a second synod, in which the bishops alone were permitted to vote, and by their suffrages Origen was degraded from the office of presbyter, and intimation of this sentence was ordered to be made by encyclical letter to the various churches. The validity of the sentence was recognised by all of them, with the exception of those in Palestine, Phœnicia, Arabia, and Achaia,—a remarkable proof of the position of influence which was at that time held by the church of Alexandria. Origen appears to have quitted the city before the bursting of the storm, and betook himself to Cæsarea, which henceforth became his home, and the seat of his future labours for a period of nearly a quarter of a century. The motives which impelled Demetrius to this treatment of Origen have been variously stated and variously criticised. Eusebius[1] refers his readers for a full account of all the matters involved to the treatise which he and Pamphilus composed in his defence; but this work has not come down to us,[2] although we possess a brief notice of it in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius,[3] from which we derive our knowledge of the proceedings of the two synods. There

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 22 and c. 33.

[2] With the exception of the first book; cf. Migne, vol. ix. pp. 542–632.

[3] Cf. Photii *Bibliotheca*, ed. Hoeschel, p. 298.

seems little reason to doubt that jealousy of interference on the part of the bishops of another diocese was one main cause of the resentment displayed by Demetrius; while it is also possible that another alleged cause, the heterodox character of some of Origen's opinions, as made known in his already published works, among which were his *Stromata* and *De Principiis*,[1] may have produced some effect upon the minds of the hostile bishops. Hefele[2] asserts that the act of the Palestinian bishops was contrary to the Church law of the time, and that Demetrius was justified on that ground for his procedure against him. But it may well be doubted whether there was any generally understood law or practice existing at so early a period of the Church's history. If so, it is difficult to understand how it should have been unknown to the Palestinian bishops; or, on the supposition of any such existing law or usage, it is equally difficult to conceive that either they themselves or Origen should have agreed to disregard it, knowing as they did the jealous temper of Demetrius, displayed on the occasion of Origen's preaching at Cæsarea already referred to, and which had drawn from the Alexandrine bishop an indignant remonstrance, in which he had asserted that such an act was "quite unheard-of before."[3] To this statement the Cæsarean bishops had replied in a letter, in which they enumerated several instances of laymen who had addressed the congregation.[4] The probabilities, therefore, are in favour of there being no generally understood law or practice on the subject, and that the procedure, therefore, was dictated by hierarchical jealousy on the part of Demetrius. According to Eusebius,[5] indeed, the act of mutilation already referred to was made a ground of accusation against Origen; and there seems no doubt that there existed an old canon of the Church,[6] based upon the words in Deut. xxiii. 1, which rendered one who had committed such an act ineligible for office in the Church. But there is no trace

[1] Eusebius expressly mentions that both these works, among others, were published before he left Alexandria.—*Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 24.

[2] *s.v.* Origenes.

[3] *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 19. [4] *Ibid.* [5] *Ibid.* b. vi. c. 8.

[6] ὁ ἀκρωτηριάσας ἑαυτὸν μὴ γενέσθω κληρικος. Cf. Redepenning, vol. i. pp. 208, 216, 218.

of this act, as disqualifying Origen for the office of presbyter, having been urged by Demetrius, so far as can be discovered from the notices of the two synods which have been preserved by Rufinus and Photius; and it seems extremely probable, as Redepenning remarks,[1] that if Demetrius were acquainted with this act of Origen, as Eusebius says he was,[2] he made no public mention of it, far less that he made it a pretence for his deposition.

Demetrius did not long survive the execution of his vengeance against his unfortunate catechist. He died about a year afterwards, and was succeeded by Heraclas, the friend and former pupil of Origen. It does not, however, appear that Heraclas made any effort to have the sentence against Origen recalled, so that he might return to the early seat of his labours. Origen devoted himself at Cæsarea chiefly to exegetical studies upon the books of Scripture, enjoying the countenance and friendship of the two bishops Alexander and Theoctistus, who are said by Eusebius "to have attended him the whole time as pupils do their master." He speedily raised the theological school of that city to a degree of reputation which attracted many pupils. Among those who placed themselves under his instructions were two young Cappadocians, who had come to Cæsarea with other intentions, but who were so attracted by the whole character and personality of Origen, that they immediately became his pupils. The former of these, afterwards Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of New Cæsarea, has left us, in the panegyric which he wrote after a discipleship of five years, a full and admiring account of the method of his great master.

The persecution under the Emperor Maximin obliged Origen to take refuge in Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he remained in concealment about two years in the house of a Christian lady named Juliana, who was the heiress of Symmachus, the Ebionite translator of the Septuagint, and from whom he obtained several MSS. which had belonged to him. Here, also, he composed his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, which was expressly written for the sake of his friends Ambrosius and Protoctetus, who had been imprisoned on account of their Christian pro-

[1] Cf. Redepenning, vol. i. p. 409, note 2. [2] *Hist. Eccles.* b. vi. c. 8.

fession, but who recovered their freedom after the death of Maximin,—an event which allowed Origen to return to the Palestinian Cæsarea and to the prosecution of his labours. A visit to Athens, where he seems to have remained some time, and to Bostra in Arabia, in order to bring back to the true faith Bishop Beryllus, who had expressed heterodox opinions upon the subject of the divinity of Christ, and in which attempt he proved successful, were the chief events of his life during the next five years. On the outbreak of the Decian persecution, however, in 249, he was imprisoned at Tyre, to which city he had gone from Cæsarea for some unknown reason, and was made to suffer great cruelties by his persecutors. The effect of these upon a frame worn out by ascetic labours may be easily conceived. Although he survived his imprisonment, his body was so weakened by his sufferings, that he died at Tyre in 254, in the seventieth year of his age.

The character of Origen is singularly pure and noble; for his moral qualities are as remarkable as his intellectual gifts. The history of the church records the names of few whose patience and meekness under unmerited suffering were more conspicuous than his. How very differently would Jerome have acted under circumstances like those which led to Origen's banishment from Alexandria! and what a favourable contrast is presented by the self-denying asceticism of his whole life, to the sins which stained the early years of Augustine prior to his conversion! The impression which his whole personality made upon those who came within the sphere of his influence is evidenced in a remarkable degree by the admiring affection displayed towards him by his friend Ambrose and his pupil Gregory. Nor was it friends alone that he so impressed. To him belongs the rare honour of convincing heretics of their errors, and of leading them back to the church,—a result which must have been due as much to the gentleness and earnestness of his Christian character, as to the prodigious learning, marvellous acuteness, and logical power, which entitle him to be regarded as the greatest of the Fathers. It is singular, indeed, that a charge of heresy should have been brought, not only after his death, but even during his life, against one who rendered such eminent services to the cause of orthodox Chris-

tianity. But this charge must be considered in reference to the times when he lived and wrote. No General Council had yet been held to settle authoritatively the doctrine of the church upon any of those great questions, the discussion of which convulsed the Christian world during the two following centuries; and in these circumstances greater latitude was naturally permissible than would have been justifiable at a later period. Moreover, a mind so speculative as that of Origen, and so engrossed with the deepest and most difficult problems of human thought, must sometimes have expressed itself in a way liable to be misunderstood. But no doubt the chief cause of his being regarded as a heretic is to be found in the haste with which he allowed many of his writings to be published. Had he considered more carefully what he intended to bring before the public eye, less occasion would have been furnished to objectors, and the memory of one of the greatest scholars and most devoted Christians that the world has ever seen would have been freed, to a great extent at least, from the reproach of heresy.

Origen was a very voluminous author. Jerome says that he wrote more than any individual could read; and Epiphanius (*Hæres.* lxiv. 63) relates that his writings amounted to 6000 volumes, by which statement we are probably to understand that every individual treatise, large or small, including each of the numerous homilies, was counted as a separate volume. The admiration entertained for him by his friend Ambrosius, and the readiness with which the latter bore all the expenses of transcription and publication, led Origen to give to the world much which otherwise would never have seen the light.

The works of the great Adamantinus may be classed under the following divisions:—

EXEGETICAL WORKS.

These comprise Σχόλια, brief notes on Scripture, of which only fragments remain: Τόμοι, Commentaries, lengthened expositions, of which we possess considerable portions, including those on Matthew, John, and Epistle to the Romans; and about 200 Homilies, upon the principal books of the Old and New Testaments, a full list of which may be seen in Migne's

edition. In these works his peculiar system of interpretation found ample scope for exercise; and although he carried out his principle of allegorizing many things, which in their historical and literal signification offended his exegetical sense, he nevertheless maintains that "the passages which hold good in their historical acceptation are much more numerous than those which contain a purely spiritual meaning;"[1] and the student will find much that is striking and suggestive in his remarks upon the various passages which he brings under review. For an account of his method of interpreting Scripture, and the grounds on which he based it, the reader may consult the fourth book of the treatise *On the Principles*.

CRITICAL WORKS.

The great critical work of Origen was the Hexapla or Six-columned Bible,—an attempt to provide a revised text of the Septuagint translation of Old Testament Scripture. On this undertaking he is said to have spent eight-and-twenty years of his life, and to have acquired a knowledge of Hebrew in order to qualify himself for the task. Each page of this work consisted, with the exception to be noticed immediately, of six columns. In the first was placed the current Hebrew text; in the second, the same represented in *Greek* letters; in the third, the version of Aquila; in the fourth, that of Symmachus; in the fifth, the text of the LXX., as it existed at the time; and in the sixth, the version of Theodotion. Having come into possession also of certain other Greek translations of some of the books of Scripture, he added these in their appropriate place, so that the work presented in some parts the appearance of seven, eight, or nine columns, and was termed Heptapla, Octopla, or Enneapla, in consequence. He inserted critical marks in the text of the LXX., an asterisk to denote what ought to be added, and an obelus to denote what ought to be omitted; taking the additions chiefly from the version of Theodotion. The work, with the omission of the Hebrew column, and that representing the Hebrew in Greek letters, was termed Tetrapla; and with regard to it, it is uncertain

[1] Origen's Works, vol. i. pp. 323-4 (Ante-Nicene Library).

whether it is to be considered a preliminary work on the part of Origen, undertaken by way of preparation for the larger, or merely as an excerpt from the latter. The whole extended, it is said, to nearly fifty volumes, and was, of course, far too bulky for common use, and too costly for transcription. It was placed in some repository in the city of Tyre, from which it was removed after Origen's death to the library at Cæsarea, founded by Pamphilus, the friend of Eusebius. It is supposed to have been burnt at the capture of Cæsarea by the Arabs in 653 A.D. The column, however, containing the version of the LXX. had been copied by Pamphilus and Eusebius, along with the critical marks of Origen, although, owing to carelessness on the part of subsequent transcribers, the text was soon again corrupted. The remains of this work were published by Montfaucon at Paris, 1713, 2 vols. folio; by Bahrdt at Leipsic in 1769; and is at present again in course of publication from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, under the editorship of Mr. Field, who has made use of the Syriac-Hexaplar version, and has added various fragments not contained in prior editions. (For a full and critical account of this work, the English reader is referred to Dr. Sam. Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i. ch. xii., which has been made use of for the above notice.)

APOLOGETICAL WORKS.

His great apologetical work was the treatise undertaken at the special request of his friend Ambrosius, in answer to the attack of the heathen philosopher Celsus on the Christian religion, in a work which he entitled *Λόγος ἀληθής*, or *A True Discourse*. Origen states that he had heard that there were two individuals of this name, both of them Epicureans, the earlier of the two having lived in the time of Nero, and the other in the time of Adrian, or later.[1] Redepenning is of opinion that Celsus must have composed his work in the time of Marcus Aurelius (161–180 A.D.), on account of his supposed mention of the Marcionites (whose leader did not make his appearance at Rome before 142 A.D.), and of the Marcellians (followers of the Carpocratian Marcellina), a sect which was

[1] Cf. *Contra Celsum*, i. c. viii. *ad fin.*

founded after the year 155 A.D. under Bishop Anicetus.[1] Origen believed his opponent to be an Epicurean, but to have adopted other doctrines than those of Epicurus, because he thought that by so doing he could assail Christianity to greater advantage.[2] The work which Origen composed in answer to the so-styled *True Discourse* consists of eight books, and belongs to the latest years of his life. It has always been regarded as the great apologetic work of antiquity; and no one can peruse it without being struck by the multifarious reading, wonderful acuteness, and rare subtlety of mind which it displays. But the rule which Origen prescribed to himself, of not allowing a single objection of his opponent to remain unanswered, leads him into a minuteness of detail, and into numerous repetitions, which fatigue the reader, and detract from the interest and unity of the work. He himself confesses that he began it on one plan, and carried it out on another.[3] No doubt, had he lived to re-write and condense it, it would have been more worthy of his reputation. But with all its defects, it is a great work, and well deserves the notice of the students of Apologetics. The table of contents prefixed to the translation will convey a better idea of its nature than any description which our limits would permit us to give.

DOGMATIC WORKS.

These include the Στρωματεῖς, a work composed in imitation of the treatise of Clement of the same name, and consisting originally of ten books, of which only three fragments exist in a Latin version by Jerome (Migne, vol. i. pp. 102–107); a treatise on the Resurrection, of which four fragments remain (Migne, vol. i. pp. 91–100); and the treatise Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, *De Principiis*, which contains Origen's views on the various questions of systematic theology. The work has come down to us in the Latin translation of his admirer Rufinus; but, from a comparison of the few fragments of the original Greek which have been preserved, we see that Rufinus was justly chargeable

[1] Cf. Redepenning, vol. ii. p. 131, note 2.
[2] *Contra Celsum*, i. ch. viii.
[3] Preface, § 6; cf. vol. i. p. 397.

with altering many of Origen's expressions, in order to bring his doctrine on certain points more into harmony with the orthodox views of the time. The *De Principiis* consists of four books, and is translated in the first volume of the works of Origen in this series, to which we refer the reader.

PRACTICAL WORKS.

Under this head we place the little treatise *Περὶ Εὐχῆς*, *On Prayer*, written at the instance of his friend Ambrose, and which contains an exposition of the Lord's Prayer; the *Λόγος προτρεπτικὸς εἰς μαρτύριον*, *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, composed at the outbreak of the persecution by Maximian, when his friends Ambrose and Protoctetus were imprisoned. Of his numerous letters only two have come down entire, viz. that which was addressed to Julius Africanus, who had questioned the genuineness of the history of Susanna in the apocryphal additions to the book of Daniel, and that to Gregory Thaumaturgus on the use of Greek philosophy in the explanation of Scripture, although, from the brevity of the latter, it is questionable whether it is more than a fragment of the original. (Both of these are translated in the first volume of Origen's works in this series.) The *Φιλοκαλία*, *Philocalia*, was a compilation from the writings of Origen, intended to explain the difficult passages of Scripture, and executed by Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus; large extracts of which have been preserved, especially of that part which was taken from the treatise against Celsus. The remains were first printed at Paris in 1618, and again at Cambridge in 1676, in the reprint of Spencer's edition of the *Contra Celsum*. In the Benedictine edition, and in Migne's reprint, the various portions are quoted in footnotes under the respective passages of Origen's writings.

EDITIONS OF ORIGEN.

The first published works of Origen were his Homilies, which appeared in 1475, although neither the name of the publisher nor the place of publication is given. These were followed by the treatise against Celsus in the translation of Christopher Persana, which appeared at Rome in 1481; and this, again, by

an edition of the Homilies at Venice in 1503, containing those on the four first books of Moses, Joshua, and Judges. The first collective edition of the whole works was given to the world in a Latin translation by James Merlin, and was published in two folio volumes, first at Paris in 1512 and 1519, and afterwards at Paris in 1522 and 1530. A revision of Merlin's edition was begun by Erasmus, and completed, after his death, by Beatus Rhenanus. This appeared at Basle in 1536 in two folio volumes, and again in 1557 and 1571. A much better and more complete edition was undertaken by the Benedictine Gilbertus Genebrardus, which was published also in two volumes folio at Paris in 1574, and again in 1604 and 1619. Hoeschel published the treatise against Celsus at Augsburg in 1605; Spencer, at Cambridge in 1658 and 1677, to which was added the *Philocalia*, which had first appeared in a Latin translation by Genebrardus, and afterwards in Greek by Tarinus at Paris in 1618 and 1624, in quarto. Huet, Bishop of Avranches, published the exegetical writings in Greek, including the Commentaries on Matthew and John, in two volumes folio, of which the one appeared at Rouen in 1668, and the other at Paris in 1679. The great edition by the two learned Benedictines of St. Maur—Charles de la Rue, and his nephew Vincent de la Rue—was published at Paris between the years 1733 and 1759. This is a work of immense industry and labour, and remains the standard to the present time. It has been reprinted by Migne in his series of the Greek Fathers, in nine volumes, large 8vo. In Oberthür's series of the Greek Fathers, seven volumes contain the chief portion of Origen's writings; while Lommatzsch has published the whole in twenty-five small volumes, Berlin 1831–48, containing the Greek text alone.—[Abridged from Redepenning.]

For further information upon the life and opinions of Origen, the reader may consult Redepenning's *Origenes*, 2 vols., Bonn 1841, 1846; the articles in Herzog's *Encyclopädie* and Wetzer's and Wette's *Kirchen-Lexikon*, by Kling and Hefele respectively; the brilliant sketch by Pressensé in his *Martyrs and Apologists* (Harwood's translation); and the learned compilation of Huet, entitled *Origeniana*, to be found in the ninth volume of Migne's edition.

ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS.

BOOK II.

Chapter I.

THE first book of our answer to the treatise of Celsus, entitled *A True Discourse*, which concluded with the representation of the Jew addressing Jesus, having now extended to a sufficient length, we intend the present part as a reply to the charges brought by him against those who have been converted from Judaism to Christianity. And we call attention, in the first place, to this special question, viz. why Celsus, when he had once resolved upon the introduction of individuals upon the stage of his book, did not represent the Jew as addressing the converts from heathenism rather than those from Judaism, seeing that his discourse, if directed to us, would have appeared more likely to produce an impression.[1] But probably this claimant to universal knowledge does not know what is appropriate in the matter of such representations; and therefore let us proceed to consider what he has to say to the converts from Judaism. He asserts that "they have forsaken the law of their fathers, in consequence of their minds being led captive by Jesus; that they have been most ridiculously deceived, and that they have become deserters to another name and to another mode of life." Here he has not observed that the Jewish converts have not deserted the law of their fathers, inasmuch as they live according to its prescriptions, receiving their very name from the poverty of the law, according to the literal acceptation of the word; for Ebion signifies "poor" among the Jews,[2] and those Jews who have received Jesus as Christ are called by the name of Ebionites. Nay, Peter himself seems to have observed

[1] πιθανώτατος.

[2] אֶבְיוֹן.

for a considerable time the Jewish observances enjoined by the law of Moses, not having yet learned from Jesus to ascend from the law that is regulated according to the letter, to that which is interpreted according to the spirit,—a fact which we learn from the Acts of the Apostles. For on the day after the angel of God appeared to Cornelius, suggesting to him "to send to Joppa, to Simon surnamed Peter," Peter "went up into the upper room to pray about the sixth hour. And he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common."[1] Now observe how, by this instance, Peter is represented as still observing the Jewish customs respecting clean and unclean animals. And from the narrative that follows, it is manifest that he, as being yet a Jew, and living according to their traditions, and despising those who were beyond the pale of Judaism, stood in need of a vision to lead him to communicate to Cornelius (who was not an Israelite according to the flesh), and to those who were with him, the word of faith. Moreover, in the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul states that Peter, still from fear of the Jews, ceased upon the arrival of James to eat with the Gentiles, and "separated himself from them, fearing them that were of the circumcision;"[2] and the rest of the Jews, and Barnabas also, followed the same course. And certainly it was quite consistent that those should not abstain from the observance of Jewish usages who were sent to minister to the circumcision, when they who "seemed to be pillars" gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, in order that, while devoting themselves to the circumcision, the latter might preach to the Gentiles. And why do I mention that they who preached to the circumcision withdrew and separated them-

[1] Cf. Acts x. 9–15. [2] Cf. Gal. ii. 12.

selves from the heathen, when even Paul himself "became as a Jew to the Jews, that he might gain the Jews?" Wherefore also in the Acts of the Apostles it is related that he even brought an offering to the altar, that he might satisfy the Jews that he was no apostate from their law.[1] Now, if Celsus had been acquainted with all these circumstances, he would not have represented the Jew holding such language as this to the converts from Judaism: "What induced you, my fellow-citizens, to abandon the law of your fathers, and to allow your minds to be led captive by him with whom we have just conversed, and thus be most ridiculously deluded, so as to become deserters from us to another name, and to the practices of another life?"

Chapter II.

Now, since we are upon the subject of Peter, and of the teachers of Christianity to the circumcision, I do not deem it out of place to quote a certain declaration of Jesus taken from the Gospel according to John, and to give the explanation of the same. For it is there related that Jesus said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all the truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak."[2] And when we inquire what were the "many things" referred to in the passage which Jesus had to say to His disciples, but which they were not then able to bear, I have to observe that, probably because the apostles were Jews, and had been trained up according to the letter of the Mosaic law, He was unable to tell them what was the true law, and how the Jewish worship consisted in the pattern and shadow of certain heavenly things, and how future blessings were foreshadowed by the injunctions regarding meats and drinks, and festivals, and new moons, and sabbaths. These were many of the subjects which He had to explain to them; but as He saw that it was a work of exceeding difficulty to root out of the mind opinions that have been almost born with a man, and amid which he has been brought up till he reached the period of maturity, and

[1] Cf. Acts xxi. 26.

[2] John xvi. 12, 13.

which have produced in those who have adopted them the belief that they are divine, and that it is an act of impiety to overthrow them; and to demonstrate by the superiority of Christian doctrine, that is, by the truth, in a manner to convince the hearers, that such opinions were but "loss and dung," He postponed such a task to a future season—to that, namely, which followed His passion and resurrection. For the bringing of aid unseasonably to those who were not yet capable of receiving it, might have overturned the idea which they had already formed of Jesus, as the Christ, and the Son of the living God. And see if there is not some well-grounded reason for such a statement as this, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now;" seeing there are many points in the law which require to be explained and cleared up in a spiritual sense, and these the disciples were in a manner unable to bear, having been born and brought up amongst Jews. I am of opinion, moreover, that since these rites were typical, and the truth was that which was to be taught them by the Holy Spirit, these words were added, "When He is come who is the Spirit of truth, He will lead you into all the truth;" as if He had said, into all the truth about those things which, being to you but types, ye believed to constitute a true worship which ye rendered unto God. And so, according to the promise of Jesus, the Spirit of truth came to Peter, saying to him, with regard to the four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the air: "Arise, Peter; kill, and eat." And the Spirit came to him while he was still in a state of superstitious ignorance; for he said, in answer to the divine command, "Not so, Lord; for I have never yet eaten anything common or unclean." He instructed him, however, in the true and spiritual meaning of meats, by saying, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." And so, after that vision, the Spirit of truth, which conducted Peter into all the truth, told him the many things which he was unable to bear when Jesus was still with him in the flesh. But I shall have another opportunity of explaining those matters, which are connected with the literal acceptation of the Mosaic law.

Chapter III.

Our present object, however, is to expose the ignorance of Celsus, who makes this Jew of his address his fellow-citizen and the Israelitish converts in the following manner: "What induced you to abandon the law of your fathers?" etc. Now, how should they have abandoned the law of their fathers, who are in the habit of rebuking those who do not listen to its commands, saying, "Tell me, ye who read the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons;" and so on, down to the place, "which things are an allegory,"[1] etc.? And how have they abandoned the law of their fathers, who are ever speaking of the usages of their fathers in such words as these: "Or does not the law say these things also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God care for oxen? or saith He it altogether for our sakes? for for our sakes it was written," and so on?[2] Now, how confused is the reasoning of the Jew in regard to these matters (although he had it in his power to speak with greater effect) when he says: "Certain among you have abandoned the usages of our fathers under a pretence of explanations and allegories; and some of you, although, as ye pretend, interpreting them in a spiritual manner, nevertheless do observe the customs of our fathers; and some of you, without any such interpretation, are willing to accept Jesus as the subject of prophecy, and to keep the law of Moses according to the customs of the fathers, as having in the words the whole mind of the Spirit." Now how was Celsus able to see these things so clearly in this place, when in the subsequent parts of his work he makes mention of certain godless heresies altogether alien from the doctrine of Jesus, and even of others which leave the Creator out of account altogether, and does not appear to know that there are Israelites who are converts to Christianity, and who have not abandoned the law of their fathers? It was not his object to investigate everything here in the spirit of truth, and to accept whatever he might find to be useful; but he composed these statements in the spirit of an enemy, and with a desire to overthrow everything as soon as he heard it.

[1] Gal. iv. 21, 22. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 8.

Chapter IV.

The Jew, then, continues his address to converts from his own nation thus: "Yesterday and the day before, when we visited with punishment the man who deluded you, ye became apostates from the law of your fathers;" showing by such statements (as we have just demonstrated) anything but an exact knowledge of the truth. But what he advances afterwards seems to have some force, when he says: "How is it that you take the beginning of your system from our worship, and when you have made some progress you treat it with disrespect, although you have no other foundation to show for your doctrines than our law?" Now, certainly the introduction to Christianity is through the Mosaic worship and the prophetic writings; and after the introduction, it is in the interpretation and explanation of these that progress takes place, while those who are introduced prosecute their investigations into "the mystery according to revelation, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest in the Scriptures of the prophets,"[1] and by the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ. But they who advance in the knowledge of Christianity do not, as ye allege, treat the things written in the law with disrespect. On the contrary, they bestow upon them greater honour, showing what a depth of wise and mysterious reasons is contained in these writings, which are not fully comprehended by the Jews, who treat them superficially, and as if they were in some degree even fabulous.[2] And what absurdity should there be in our system—that is, the gospel—having the law for its foundation, when even the Lord Jesus Himself said to those who would not believe upon Him: "If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye do not believe his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"[3] Nay, even one of the evangelists—Mark—says: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in the prophet Isaiah, Behold, I send my messenger before Thy face, who shall prepare Thy way before Thee,"[4]

[1] Rom. xvi. 25.

[2] τῶν ἐπιπολαιότερον καὶ μυθικώτερον αὐτοῖς ἐντυγχανόντων.

[3] John v. 46, 47.

[4] Mark i. 1, 2.

which shows that the beginning of the gospel is connected with the Jewish writings. What force, then, is there in the objection of the Jew of Celsus, that "if any one predicted to us that the Son of God was to visit mankind, he was one of our prophets, and the prophet of our God?" Or how is it a charge against Christianity, that John, who baptized Jesus, was a Jew? For although He was a Jew, it does not follow that every believer, whether a convert from heathenism or from Judaism, must yield a literal obedience to the law of Moses.

Chapter V.

After these matters, although Celsus becomes tautological in his statements about Jesus, repeating for the second time that "he was punished by the Jews for his crimes," we shall not again take up the defence, being satisfied with what we have already said. But, in the next place, as this Jew of his disparages the doctrine regarding the resurrection of the dead, and the divine judgment, and of the rewards to be bestowed upon the just, and of the fire which is to devour the wicked, as being stale[1] opinions, and thinks that he will overthrow Christianity by asserting that there is nothing new in its teaching upon these points, we have to say to him, that our Lord, seeing the conduct of the Jews not to be at all in keeping with the teaching of the prophets, inculcated by a parable that the kingdom of God would be taken from them, and given to the converts from heathenism. For which reason, now, we may also see of a truth that all the doctrines of the Jews of the present day are mere trifles and fables,[2] since they have not the light that proceeds from the knowledge of the Scriptures; whereas those of the Christians are the truth, having power to raise and elevate the soul and understanding of man, and to persuade him to seek a citizenship, not like the earthly[3] Jews here below, but in heaven. And this result shows itself among those who are able to see the grandeur of the ideas contained in the law and the prophets, and who are able to commend them to others.

Chapter VI.

But let it be granted that Jesus observed all the Jewish

[1] ἤωλα. [2] μύθους καὶ λήρους. [3] τοῖς κάτω Ἰουδαίοις.

usages, including even their sacrificial observances, what does that avail to prevent our recognising Him as the Son of God? Jesus, then, is the Son of God, who gave the law and the prophets; and we, who belong to the church, do not transgress the law, but have escaped the mythologizings[1] of the Jews, and have our minds chastened and educated by the mystical contemplation of the law and the prophets. For the prophets themselves, as not resting the sense of these words in the plain history which they relate, nor in the legal enactments taken according to the word and letter, express themselves somewhere, when about to relate histories, in words like this, "I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter hard sayings of old;"[2] and in another place, when offering up a prayer regarding the law as being obscure, and needing divine help for its comprehension, they offer up this prayer, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law."[3]

Chapter VII.

Moreover, let them show where there is to be found even the appearance of language dictated by arrogance,[4] and proceeding from Jesus. For how could an arrogant man thus express himself, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and you shall find rest for your souls?"[5] or how can He be styled arrogant, who after supper laid aside His garments in the presence of His disciples, and, after girding Himself with a towel, and pouring water into a basin, proceeded to wash the feet of each disciple, and rebuked him who was unwilling to allow them to be washed, with the words, "Except I wash thee, thou hast no part with me?"[6] Or how could He be called such who said, "I was amongst you, not as he that sitteth at meat, but as he that serveth?"[7] And let any one show what were the falsehoods which He uttered, and let him point out what are great and what are small falsehoods, that he may prove Jesus to have been guilty of the former. And there is yet another way in which we may confute him. For as one falsehood is not less or more false than another, so one truth is not less or more true than another. And what charges of

[1] μυθολογίας. [2] Ps. lxxvii. 2. [3] Ps. cxix. 18. [4] ἀλαζονεία.
[5] Matt. xi. 29. [6] John xvi. 4. [7] Luke xxii. 27.

impiety he has to bring against Jesus, let the Jew of Celsus especially bring forward. Was it impious to abstain from corporeal circumcision, and from a literal Sabbath, and literal festivals, and literal new moons, and from clean and unclean meats, and to turn the mind to the good and true and spiritual law of God, while at the same time he who was an ambassador for Christ knew how to become to the Jews as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews, and to those who are under the law, as under the law, that he might gain those who are under the law?

Chapter VIII.

He says, further, that "many other persons would appear such as Jesus was, to those who were willing to be deceived." Let this Jew of Celsus then show us, not many persons, nor even a few, but a single individual, such as Jesus was, introducing among the human race, with the power that was manifested in Him, a system of doctrine and opinions beneficial to human life, and which converts men from the practice of wickedness. He says, moreover, that this charge is brought against the Jews by the Christian converts, that they have not believed in Jesus as in God. Now on this point we have, in the preceding pages, offered a preliminary defence, showing at the same time in what respects we understand Him to be God, and in what we take Him to be man. "How should we," he continues, "who have made known to all men that there is to come from God one who is to punish the wicked, treat him with disregard when he came?" And to this, as an exceedingly silly argument, it does not seem to me reasonable to offer any answer. It is as if some one were to say, "How could we, who teach temperance, commit any act of licentiousness? or we, who are ambassadors for righteousness, be guilty of any wickedness?" For as these inconsistencies are found among men, so, to say that they believed the prophets when speaking of the future advent of Christ, and yet refused their belief to Him when He came, agreeably to prophetic statement, was quite in keeping with human nature. And since we must add another reason, we shall remark that this very result was foretold by the prophets. Isaiah distinctly declares: "Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and

shall not perceive: for the heart of this people has become fat,"[1] etc. And let them explain why it was predicted to the Jews, that although they both heard and saw, they would not understand what was said, nor perceive what was seen as they ought. For it is indeed manifest, that when they beheld Jesus they did not see who He was; and when they heard Him, they did not understand from His words the divinity that was in Him, and which transferred God's providential care, hitherto exercised over the Jews, to His converts from the heathen. Therefore we may see, that after the advent of Jesus the Jews were altogether abandoned, and possess now none of what were considered their ancient glories, so that there is no indication of any Divinity abiding amongst them. For they have no longer prophets nor miracles, traces of which to a considerable extent are still found among Christians, and some of them more remarkable than any that existed among the Jews; and these we ourselves have witnessed, if our testimony may be received. But the Jew of Celsus exclaims: "Why did we treat him, whom we announced beforehand, with dishonour? Was it that we might be chastised more than others?" To which we have to answer, that on account of their unbelief, and the other insults which they heaped upon Jesus, the Jews will not only suffer more than others in that judgment which is believed to impend over the world, but have even already endured such sufferings. For what nation is an exile from their own metropolis, and from the place sacred to the worship of their fathers, save the Jews alone? And these calamities they have suffered, because they were a most wicked nation, which, although guilty of many other sins, yet has been punished so severely for none, as for those that were committed against our Jesus.

Chapter IX.

The Jew continues his discourse thus: "How should we deem him to be a God, who not only in other respects, as was currently reported, performed none of his promises, but who also, after we had convicted him, and condemned him as deserving of punishment, was found attempting to conceal himself, and

[1] Isa. vi. 9.

endeavouring to escape in a most disgraceful manner, and who was betrayed by those whom he called disciples? And yet," he continues, "he who was a God could neither flee nor be led away a prisoner; and least of all could he be deserted and delivered up by those who had been his associates, and had shared all things in common, and had had him for their teacher, who was deemed to be a Saviour, and a Son of the greatest God, and an angel." To which we reply, that even we do not suppose the body of Jesus, which was then an object of sight and perception, to have been God. And why do I say His body? Nay, not even His soul, of which it is related, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death."[1] But as, according to the Jewish manner of speaking, "I am the Lord, the God of all flesh," and, "Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me," God is believed to be He who employs the soul and body of the prophet as an instrument; and as, according to the Greeks, he who says,

"I know both the number of the sand, and the measures of the sea,
And I understand a dumb man, and hear him who does not speak,"[2]

is considered to be a god when speaking, and making himself heard through the Pythian priestess; so, according to our view, it was the Logos God, and Son of the God of all things, who spake in Jesus these words, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life;" and these, "I am the door;" and these, "I am the living bread that came down from heaven;" and other expressions similar to these. We therefore charge the Jews with not acknowledging Him to be God, to whom testimony was borne in many passages by the prophets, to the effect that He was a mighty power, and a God next to[3] the God and

[1] Matt. xxvi. 38.

[2] Herodot. b. i. 47.

[3] καὶ Θεὸν κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα. "Ex mente Origenis, inquit Boherellus, vertendum 'Secundo post universi Deum atque parentem loco;' non cum interprete Gelenio, 'Ipsius rerum universarum Dei atque Parentis testimonio.' Nam si hic esset sensus, frustra post ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν, adderetur κατὰ τὸν Θεόν. Præterea, hæc epitheta, τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, manifestam continent antithesin ad ista, μεγάλην ὄντα δύναμιν καὶ Θεόν, ut Pater supra Filium evehatur, quemadmodum evehitur ab Origene infra libro octavo, num. 15. Τοῦ, κατά, inferiorem ordinem denotantis exempla afferre supersedeo, cum obvia sint."—Ruæus.

Father of all things. For we assert that it was to Him the Father gave the command, when in the Mosaic account of the creation He uttered the words, "Let there be light," and "Let there be a firmament," and gave the injunctions with regard to those other creative acts which were performed; and that to Him also were addressed the words, "Let us make man in our own image and likeness;" and that the Logos, when commanded, obeyed all the Father's will. And we make these statements not from our own conjectures, but because we believe the prophecies circulated among the Jews, in which it is said of God, and of the works of creation, in express words, as follows: "He spake, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created."[1] Now if God gave the command, and the creatures were formed, who, according to the view of the spirit of prophecy, could he be that was able to carry out such commands of the Father, save Him who, so to speak, is the living Logos and the Truth? And that the Gospels do not consider him who in Jesus said these words, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life," to have been of so circumscribed a nature,[2] as to have an existence nowhere out of the soul and body of Jesus, is evident both from many considerations, and from a few instances of the following kind which we shall quote. John the Baptist, when predicting that the Son of God was to appear immediately, not in that body and soul, but as manifesting Himself everywhere, says regarding Him: "There stands in the midst of you One whom ye know not, who cometh after me."[3] For if he had thought that the Son of God was only there, where was the visible body of Jesus, how could he have said, "There stands in the midst of you One whom ye know not?" And Jesus Himself, in raising the minds of His disciples to higher thoughts of the Son of God, says: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of you."[4] And of the same nature is His promise to His disciples: "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."[5] And we quote these passages, making no distinction between the Son of God and Jesus. For the soul and body of Jesus formed, after the *οἰκονομία*, one being with the

[1] Ps. cxlviii. 5. [2] *περιγεγραμμένον τινα.* [3] John i. 26.
[4] Matt. xviii. 20. [5] Matt. xxviii. 20.

Logos of God. Now if, according to Paul's teaching, "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit,"[1] every one who understands what being joined to the Lord is, and who has been actually joined to Him, is one spirit with the Lord; how should not that being be one in a far greater and more divine degree, which was once united with the Logos of God?[2] He, indeed, manifested Himself among the Jews as the power of God, by the miracles which He performed, which Celsus suspected were accomplished by sorcery, but which by the Jews of that time were attributed, I know not why, to Beelzebub, in the words: "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils."[3] But these our Saviour convicted of uttering the greatest absurdities, from the fact that the kingdom of evil was not yet come to an end. And this will be evident to all intelligent readers of the Gospel narrative, which it is not now the time to explain.

Chapter X.

But what promise did Jesus make which He did not perform? Let Celsus produce any instance of such, and make good his charge. But he will be unable to do so, especially since it is from mistakes, arising either from misapprehension of the Gospel narratives, or from Jewish stories, that he thinks to derive the charges which he brings against Jesus or against ourselves. Moreover, again, when the Jew says, "We both found him guilty, and condemned him as deserving of death," let them show how they who sought to concoct false witness against Him proved Him to be guilty. Was not the great charge against Jesus, which His accusers brought forward, this, that He said, "I am able to destroy the temple of God, and after three days to raise it up again?"[4] But in so saying, He spake of the temple of His body; while they thought, not being able to understand the meaning of the speaker, that

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 16.

[2] εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Παύλου διδασκαλίαν, λέγοντος· "ὁ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ, ἓν πνεῦμα ἐστι·" πᾶς ὁ νοήσας τί τὸ κολλᾶσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ κολληθεὶς αὐτῷ, ἓν ἐστι πνεῦμα πρὸς τὸν κύριον· πῶς οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον θειοτέρως καὶ μειζόνως ἓν ἐστι τὸ ποτε σύνθετον πρὸς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ;

[3] Matt. xii. 24.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 61.

His reference was to the temple of stone, which was treated by the Jews with greater respect than He was who ought to have been honoured as the true Temple of God—the Word, and the Wisdom, and the Truth. And who can say that "Jesus attempted to make His escape by disgracefully concealing Himself?" Let any one point to an act deserving to be called disgraceful. And when he adds, "he was taken prisoner," I would say that, if to be taken prisoner implies an act done against one's will, then Jesus was not taken prisoner; for at the fitting time He did not prevent Himself falling into the hands of men, as the Lamb of God, that He might take away the sin of the world. For, knowing all things that were to come upon Him, He went forth, and said to them, "Whom seek ye?" and they answered, "Jesus of Nazareth;" and He said unto them, "I am He." And Judas also, who betrayed Him, was standing with them. When, therefore, He had said to them, "I am He," they went backwards and fell to the ground. Again He asked them, "Whom seek ye?" and they said again, "Jesus of Nazareth." Jesus said to them, "I told you I am He; if then ye seek me, let these go away."[1] Nay, even to him who wished to help Him, and who smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his ear, He said: "Put up thy sword into its sheath: for all they who draw the sword shall perish by the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot even now pray to my Father, and He will presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"[2] And if any one imagines these statements to be inventions of the writers of the Gospels, why should not those statements rather be regarded as inventions which proceeded from a spirit of hatred and hostility against Jesus and the Christians? and these the truth, which proceed from those who manifest the sincerity of their feelings towards Jesus, by enduring everything, whatever it may be, for the sake of His words? For the reception by the disciples of such power of endurance and resolution continued even to death, with a disposition of mind that would not invent regarding their Teacher what was not true, is a very evident proof to all candid judges that they were fully persuaded of the truth of what they

[1] John xviii. 4 sqq. [2] Matt. xxvi. 52–54.

wrote, seeing they submitted to trials so numerous and so severe, for the sake of Him whom they believed to be the Son of God.

Chapter XI.

In the next place, that He was betrayed by those whom He called His disciples, is a circumstance which the Jew of Celsus learned from the Gospels; calling the one Judas, however, "many disciples," that he might seem to add force to the accusation. Nor did he trouble himself to take note of all that is related concerning Judas; how this Judas, having come to entertain opposite and conflicting opinions regarding his Master, neither opposed Him with his whole soul, nor yet with his whole soul preserved the respect due by a pupil to his teacher. For he that betrayed Him gave to the multitude that came to apprehend Jesus, a sign, saying, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, it is he; seize ye him,"—retaining still some element of respect for his Master: for unless he had done so, he would have betrayed Him, even publicly, without any pretence of affection. This circumstance, therefore, will satisfy all with regard to the purpose of Judas, that along with his covetous disposition, and his wicked design to betray his Master, he had still a feeling of a mixed character in his mind, produced in him by the words of Jesus, which had the appearance (so to speak) of some remnant of good. For it is related that, "when Judas, who betrayed Him, knew that He was condemned, he repented, and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the high priest and elders, saying, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. But they said, What is that to us? see thou to that;"[1] —and that, having thrown the money down in the temple, he departed, and went and hanged himself. But if this covetous Judas, who also stole the money placed in the bag for the relief of the poor, repented, and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, it is clear that the instructions of Jesus had been able to produce some feeling of repentance in his mind, and were not altogether despised and loathed by this traitor. Nay, the declaration, "I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood," was a public acknowledgment of his crime. Observe, also, how exceedingly passionate[2]

[1] Matt. xxvii. 3–5.

[2] διάπυρος καὶ σφοδρά.

was the sorrow for his sins that proceeded from that repentance, and which would not suffer him any longer to live; and how, after he had cast the money down in the temple, he withdrew, and went away and hanged himself: for he passed sentence upon himself, showing what a power the teaching of Jesus had over this sinner Judas, this thief and traitor, who could not always treat with contempt what he had learned from Jesus. Will Celsus and his friends now say that those proofs which show that the apostasy of Judas was not a complete apostasy, even after his attempts against his Master, are inventions, and that this alone is true, viz. that one of His disciples betrayed Him; and will they add to the scriptural account that he betrayed Him also with his whole heart? To act in this spirit of hostility with the same writings, both as to what we are to believe and what we are not to believe, is absurd.[1] And if we must make a statement regarding Judas which may overwhelm our opponents with shame, we would say that, in the book of Psalms, the whole of the 108th contains a prophecy about Judas, the beginning of which is this: "O God, hold not Thy peace before my praise; for the mouth of the sinner, and the mouth of the crafty man, are opened against me."[2] And it is predicted in this psalm, both that Judas separated himself from the number of the apostles on account of his sins, and that another was selected in his place; and this is shown by the words: "And his bishopric let another take."[3] But suppose now that He had been betrayed by some one of His disciples, who was possessed by a worse spirit than Judas, and who had completely poured out, as it were, all the words which he had heard from Jesus, what would this contribute to an accusation against Jesus or the Christian religion? And how will this demonstrate its doctrine to be false? We have replied in the preceding chapter to the statements which follow this, showing that Jesus was not taken prisoner when attempting to flee, but that He gave Himself up voluntarily for the sake of us all. Whence it follows, that even if He were bound, He was bound agreeably to His own will; thus teaching us the lesson that we should undertake similar things for the sake of religion in no spirit of unwillingness.

[1] ἀπίθανον. [2] Ps. cix. 1, 2. [3] Ps. cix. 8.

Chapter XII.

And the following appear to me to be childish assertions, viz. that "no good general and leader of great multitudes was ever betrayed; nor even a wicked captain of robbers and commander of very wicked men, who seemed to be of any use to his associates; but Jesus, having been betrayed by his subordinates, neither governed like a good general, nor, after deceiving his disciples, produced in the minds of the victims of his deceit that feeling of good-will which, so to speak, would be manifested towards a brigand chief." Now one might find many accounts of generals who were betrayed by their own soldiers, and of robber chiefs who were captured through the instrumentality of those who did not keep their bargains with them. But grant that no general or robber chief was ever betrayed, what does that contribute to the establishment of the fact as a charge against Jesus, that one of His disciples became His betrayer? And since Celsus makes an ostentatious exhibition of philosophy, I would ask of him, If, then, it was a charge against Plato, that Aristotle, after being his pupil for twenty years, went away and assailed his doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and styled the ideas of Plato the merest trifling?[1] And if I were still in doubt, I would continue thus: Was Plato no longer mighty in dialectics, nor able to defend his views, after Aristotle had taken his departure; and, on that account, are the opinions of Plato false? Or may it not be, that while Plato is true, as the pupils of his philosophy would maintain, Aristotle was guilty of wickedness and ingratitude towards his teacher? Nay, Chrysippus also, in many places of his writings, appears to assail Cleanthes, introducing novel opinions opposed to his views, although the latter had been his teacher when he was a young man, and began the study of philosophy. Aristotle, indeed, is said to have been Plato's pupil for twenty years, and no inconsiderable period was spent by Chrysippus in the school of Cleanthes; while Judas did not remain so much as three years with Jesus. But from the narratives of the lives of philosophers we might take many instances similar to those on which Celsus founds a charge against Jesus on account of

[1] τερετίσματα.

Judas. Even the Pythagoreans erected cenotaphs[1] to those who, after betaking themselves to philosophy, fell back again into their ignorant mode of life; and yet neither was Pythagoras nor his followers, on that account, weak in argument and demonstration.

Chapter XIII.

This Jew of Celsus continues, after the above, in the following fashion: "Although he could state many things regarding the events of the life of Jesus which are true, and not like those which are recorded by the disciples, he willingly omits them." What, then, are those true statements, unlike the accounts in the Gospels, which the Jew of Celsus passes by without mention? Or is he only employing what appears to be a figure of speech,[2] in pretending to have something to say, while in reality he had nothing to produce beyond the Gospel narrative which could impress the hearer with a feeling of its truth, and furnish a clear ground of accusation against Jesus and His doctrine? And he charges the disciples with having invented the statement that Jesus foreknew and foretold all that happened to Him; but the truth of this statement we shall establish, although Celsus may not like it, by means of many other predictions uttered by the Saviour, in which He foretold what would befall the Christians in after generations. And who is there who would not be astonished at this prediction: "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles;"[3] and at any others which He may have delivered respecting the future persecution of His disciples? For what system of opinions ever existed among men on account of which others are punished, so that any one of the accusers of Jesus could say that, foreseeing the impiety or falsity of his opinions to be the ground of an accusation against them, he thought that this would redound to his credit, that he had so predicted regarding it long before? Now if any deserve to be brought, on account of their opinions, before governors and kings, what others are they, save the Epicureans, who altogether deny the existence of providence?

[1] Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. c. ix.

[2] δοκούσῃ δεινότητι ῥητορικῇ.

[3] Matt. x. 18.

And also the Peripatetics, who say that prayers are of no avail, and sacrifices offered as to the Divinity? But some one will say that the Samaritans suffer persecution because of their religion. In answer to whom we shall state that the Sicarians,[1] on account of the practice of circumcision, as mutilating themselves contrary to the established laws and the customs permitted to the Jews alone, are put to death. And you never hear a judge inquiring whether a Sicarian who strives to live according to this established religion of his will be released from punishment if he apostatizes, but will be led away to death if he continues firm; for the evidence of the circumcision is sufficient to ensure the death of him who has undergone it. But Christians alone, according to the prediction of their Saviour, "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake," are urged up to their last breath by their judges to deny Christianity, and to sacrifice according to the public customs; and after the oath of abjuration, to return to their homes, and to live in safety. And observe whether it is not with great authority that this declaration is uttered: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven. And whosoever shall deny me before men," [2] etc. And go back with me in thought to Jesus when He uttered these words, and see His predictions not yet accomplished. Perhaps you will say, in a spirit of incredulity, that he is talking folly, and speaking to no purpose, for his words will have no fulfilment; or, being in doubt about assenting to his words, you will say, that if these predictions be fulfilled, and the doctrine of Jesus be established, so that governors and kings think of destroying those who acknowledge Jesus, then we shall believe that he utters these prophecies as one who has received great power from God to implant this doctrine among the human race, and as believing that it will prevail. And who will not be filled with wonder, when he goes back in thought to Him who then taught and said, "This gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, for a testimony against

[1] Modestinus, lib. vi. *Regularum, ad legem Corneliam de Sicariis:* "Circumcidere filios suos Judæis tantum rescripto divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis pœna irrogatur."

[2] Matt. x. 18.

them and the Gentiles," and beholds, agreeably to His words, the gospel of Jesus Christ preached in the whole world under heaven to Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish alike? For the word, spoken with power, has gained the mastery over men of all sorts of nature, and it is impossible to see any race of men which has escaped accepting the teaching of Jesus. But let this Jew of Celsus, who does not believe that He foreknew all that happened to Him, consider how, while Jerusalem was still standing, and the whole Jewish worship celebrated in it, Jesus foretold what would befall it from the hand of the Romans. For they will not maintain that the acquaintances and pupils of Jesus Himself handed down His teaching contained in the Gospels without committing it to writing, and left His disciples without the memoirs of Jesus contained in their works. Now in these it is recorded, that "when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed about with armies, then shall ye know that the desolation thereof is nigh."[1] But at that time there were no armies around Jerusalem, encompassing and enclosing and besieging it; for the siege began in the reign of Nero, and lasted till the government of Vespasian, whose son Titus destroyed Jerusalem, on account, as Josephus says, of James the Just, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, but in reality, as the truth makes clear, on account of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

Chapter XIV.

Celsus, however, accepting or granting that Jesus foreknew what would befall Him, might think to make light of the admission, as he did in the case of the miracles, when he alleged that they were wrought by means of sorcery; for he might say that many persons by means of divination, either by auspices, or auguries, or sacrifices, or nativities, have come to the knowledge of what was to happen. But this concession he would not make, as being too great a one; and although he somehow granted that Jesus worked miracles, he thought to weaken the force of this by the charge of sorcery. Now Phlegon, in the thirteenth or fourteenth book, I think, of his Chronicles, not only ascribed to Jesus a knowledge of future events (although

[1] Matt. xxiv. 14.

falling into confusion about some things which refer to Peter, as if they referred to Jesus), but also testified that the result corresponded to His predictions. So that he also, by these very admissions regarding foreknowledge, as if against his will, expressed his opinion that the doctrines taught by the fathers of our system were not devoid of divine power.

Chapter XV.

Celsus continues: "The disciples of Jesus, having no undoubted fact on which to rely, devised the fiction that he foreknew everything before it happened;" not observing, or not wishing to observe, the love of truth which actuated the writers, who acknowledged that Jesus had told His disciples beforehand, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night," — a statement which was fulfilled by their all being offended; and that He predicted to Peter, "Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice," which was followed by Peter's threefold denial. Now if they had not been lovers of truth, but, as Celsus supposes, inventors of fictions, they would not have represented Peter as denying, nor His disciples as being offended. For although these events actually happened, who could have proved that they turned out in that manner? And yet, according to all probability, these were matters which ought to have been passed over in silence by men who wished to teach the readers of the Gospels to despise death for the sake of confessing Christianity. But now, seeing that the word, by its power, will gain the mastery over men, they related those facts which they have done, and which, I know not how, were neither to do any harm to their readers, nor to afford any pretext for denial.

Chapter XVI.

Exceedingly weak is his assertion, that "the disciples of Jesus wrote such accounts regarding him, by way of extenuating the charges that told against him: as if," he says, "any one were to say that a certain person was a just man, and yet were to show that he was guilty of injustice; or that he was pious, and yet had committed murder; or that he was immortal, and yet was dead; subjoining to all these statements

the remark that he had foretold all these things." Now his illustrations are at once seen to be inappropriate; for there is no absurdity in Him who had resolved that He would become a living pattern to men, as to the manner in which they were to regulate their lives, showing also how they ought to die for the sake of their religion, apart altogether from the fact that His death on behalf of men was a benefit to the whole world, as we proved in the preceding book. He imagines, moreover, that the whole of the confession of the Saviour's sufferings confirms his objection instead of weakening it. For he is not acquainted either with the philosophical remarks of Paul,[1] or the statements of the prophets, on this subject. And it escaped him that certain heretics have declared that Jesus underwent His sufferings in appearance, not in reality. For had he known, he would not have said: "For ye do not even allege this, that he seemed to wicked men to suffer this punishment, though not undergoing it in reality; but, on the contrary, ye acknowledge that he openly suffered." But we do not view His sufferings as having been merely in appearance, in order that His resurrection also may not be a false, but a real event. For he who really died, actually arose, if he did arise; whereas he who appeared only to have died, did not in reality arise. But since the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a subject of mockery to unbelievers, we shall quote the words of Plato,[2] that Herus the son of Armenius rose from the funeral pile twelve days after he had been laid upon it, and gave an account of what he had seen in Hades; and as we are replying to unbelievers, it will not be altogether useless to refer in this place to what Heraclides[3] relates respecting the woman who was deprived of life. And many persons are recorded to have risen from their tombs, not only on the day of their burial, but also on the day following. What wonder is it, then, if in the case of one who performed many marvellous things, both beyond the power of man and with such fulness of evidence, that he who could not deny their performance, endeavoured to calumniate them by comparing them to acts of sorcery, should have manifested also in His death some greater display of divine power, so that His

[1] ὅσα περὶ τούτου καὶ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ πεφιλοσόφηται.

[2] Cf. Plato, *de Rep.* x.

[3] Cf. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* vii. c. 52.

soul, if it pleased, might leave its body, and having performed certain offices out of it, might return again at pleasure? And such a declaration is Jesus said to have made in the Gospel of John, when He said: "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."[1] And perhaps it was on this account that He hastened His departure from the body, that He might preserve it, and that His legs might not be broken, as were those of the robbers who were crucified with Him. "For the soldiers broke the legs of the first, and of the other who was crucified with Him; but when they came to Jesus, and saw that He was dead, they brake not His legs."[2] We have accordingly answered the question, "How is it credible that Jesus could have predicted these things?" And with respect to this, "How could the dead man be immortal?" let him who wishes to understand know, that it is not the dead man who is immortal, but He who rose from the dead. So far, indeed, was the dead man from being immortal, that even the Jesus before His decease—the compound being, who was to suffer death—was not immortal.[3] For no one is immortal who is destined to die; but he is immortal when he shall no longer be subject to death. But "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over Him;"[4] although those may be unwilling to admit this who cannot understand how such things should be said.

Chapter XVII.

Extremely foolish also is his remark, "What God, or spirit, or prudent man would not, on foreseeing that such events were to befall him, avoid them if he could; whereas he threw himself headlong into those things which he knew beforehand were to happen?" And yet Socrates knew that he would die after drinking the hemlock, and it was in his power, if he had allowed himself to be persuaded by Crito, by escaping from prison, to avoid these calamities; but nevertheless he decided,

[1] John x. 18.

[2] John xix. 52.

[3] Οὐ μόνον οὖν οὐχ ὁ νεκρὸς ἀθάνατος, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὁ πρὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ Ἰησοῦς ὁ σύνθετος ἀθάνατος ἦν, ὅς γε ἔμελλε τεθνήξεσθαι.

[4] Rom. vi. 9.

as it appeared to him consistent with right reason, that it was better for him to die as became a philosopher, than to retain his life in a manner unbecoming one. Leonidas also, the Lacedemonian general, knowing that he was on the point of dying with his followers at Thermopylæ, did not make any effort to preserve his life by disgraceful means, but said to his companions, "Let us go to breakfast, as we shall sup in Hades." And those who are interested in collecting stories of this kind, will find numbers of them. Now, where is the wonder if Jesus, knowing all things that were to happen, did not avoid them, but encountered what He foreknew; when Paul, His own disciple, having heard what would befall him when he went up to Jerusalem, proceeded to face the danger, reproaching those who were weeping around him, and endeavouring to prevent him from going up to Jerusalem? Many also of our contemporaries, knowing well that if they made a confession of Christianity they would be put to death, but that if they denied it they would be liberated, and their property restored, despised life, and voluntarily selected death for the sake of their religion.

Chapter XVIII.

After this the Jew makes another silly remark, saying, "How is it that, if Jesus pointed out beforehand both the traitor and the perjurer, they did not fear him as a God, and cease, the one from his intended treason, and the other from his perjury?" Here the learned Celsus did not see the contradiction in his statement: for if Jesus foreknew events as a God, then it was impossible for His foreknowledge to prove untrue; and therefore it was impossible for him who was known to Him as going to betray Him not to execute his purpose, nor for him who was rebuked as going to deny Him not to have been guilty of that crime. For if it had been possible for the one to abstain from the act of betrayal, and the other from that of denial, as having been warned of the consequences of these actions beforehand, then His words were no longer true, who predicted that the one would betray Him and the other deny Him. For if He had foreknowledge of the traitor, He knew the wickedness in which the treason

originated, and this wickedness was by no means taken away by the foreknowledge. And, again, if He had ascertained that one would deny Him, He made that prediction from seeing the weakness out of which that act of denial would arise, and yet this weakness was not to be taken away thus at once[1] by the foreknowledge. But whence he derived the statement, "that these persons betrayed and denied him without manifesting any concern about him," I know not; for it was proved, with respect to the traitor, that it is false to say that he betrayed his master without an exhibition of anxiety regarding Him. And this was shown to be equally true of him who denied Him; for he went out, after the denial, and wept bitterly.

Chapter XIX.

Superficial also is his objection, that "it is always the case when a man against whom a plot is formed, and who comes to the knowledge of it, makes known to the conspirators that he is acquainted with their design, that the latter are turned from their purpose, and keep upon their guard." For many have continued to plot even against those who were acquainted with their plans. And then, as if bringing his argument to a conclusion, he says: "Not because these things were predicted did they come to pass, for that is impossible; but since they have come to pass, their being predicted is shown to be a falsehood: for it is altogether impossible that those who heard beforehand of the discovery of their designs, should carry out their plans of betrayal and denial!" But if his premisses are overthrown, then his conclusion also falls to the ground, viz. "that we are not to believe, because these things were predicted, that they have come to pass." Now we maintain that they not only came to pass as being possible, but also that, because they came to pass, the fact of their being predicted is shown to be true; for the truth regarding future events is judged of by results. It is false, therefore, as asserted by him, that the prediction of these events is proved to be untrue; and it is to no purpose that he says, "It is altogether impossible for those who heard beforehand that their designs were discovered, to carry out their plans of betrayal and denial."

[1] οὕτως ἀθρόως.

Chapter XX.

Let us see how he continues after this: "These events," he says, "he predicted as being a God, and the prediction must by all means come to pass. God, therefore, who above all others ought to do good to men, and especially to those of his own household, led on his own disciples and prophets, with whom he was in the habit of eating and drinking, to such a degree of wickedness, that they became impious and unholy men. Now, of a truth, he who shared a man's table would not be guilty of conspiring against him; but after banqueting with God, he became a conspirator. And, what is still more absurd, God himself plotted against the members of his own table, by converting them into traitors and villains!" Now, since you wish me to answer even those charges of Celsus which seem to me frivolous,[1] the following is our reply to such statements. Celsus imagines that an event, predicted through foreknowledge, comes to pass because it was predicted; but we do not grant this, maintaining that he who foretold it was not the cause of its happening, because he foretold it would happen; but the future event itself, which would have taken place though not predicted, afforded the occasion to him, who was endowed with foreknowledge, of foretelling its occurrence. Now, certainly this result is present to the foreknowledge of him who predicts an event, when it is possible that it may or may not happen, viz. that one or other of these things will take place. For we do not assert that he who foreknows an event, by secretly taking away the possibility of its happening or not, makes any such declaration as this: "This shall infallibly happen, and it is impossible that it can be otherwise." And this remark applies to all the foreknowledge of events dependent upon ourselves, whether contained in the sacred Scriptures or in the histories of the Greeks. Now, what is called by logicians an "idle argument,"[2] which is a sophism, will be no sophism as far as Celsus can help, but according to sound reasoning it is a sophism. And that this may be seen, I shall take from the Scriptures the predictions regarding Judas, or the foreknowledge of our Saviour regarding him as the traitor; and from the Greek histories the oracle that was given

[1] εὐτελέσι. [2] ἀργὸς λόγος.

to Laius, conceding for the present its truth, since it does not affect the argument. Now, in Ps. cix., Judas is spoken of by the mouth of the Saviour, in words beginning thus: "Hold not Thy peace, O God of my praise; for the mouth of the wicked and the mouth of the deceitful are opened against me." Now, if you carefully observe the contents of the psalm, you will find that, as it was foreknown that he would betray the Saviour, so also was he considered to be himself the cause of the betrayal, and deserving, on account of his wickedness, of the imprecations contained in the prophecy. For let him suffer these things, "because," says the psalmist, "he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man." Wherefore it was possible for him to show mercy, and not to persecute him whom he did persecute. But although he might have done these things, he did not do them, but carried out the act of treason, so as to merit the curses pronounced against him in the prophecy.

And in answer to the Greeks we shall quote the following oracular response to Laius, as recorded by the tragic poet, either in the exact words of the oracle or in equivalent terms. Future events are thus made known to him by the oracle: "Do not try to beget children against the will of the gods. For if you beget a son, your son shall murder you; and all your household shall wade in blood."[1] Now from this it is clear that it was within the power of Laius not to try to beget children, for the oracle would not have commanded an impossibility; and it was also in his power to do the opposite, so that neither of these courses was compulsory. And the consequence of his not guarding against the begetting of children was, that he suffered from so doing the calamities described in the tragedies relating to Œdipus and Jocasta and their sons. Now that which is called the "idle argument," being a quibble, is such as might be applied, say in the case of a sick man, with the view of sophistically preventing him from employing a physician to promote his recovery; and it is something like this: "If it is decreed that you should recover from your disease, you will recover whether you call in a physician or not; but if it is decreed that you should not recover, you will

[1] Euripid. *Phœnissæ*, 18–20.

not recover whether you call in a physician or no. But it is certainly decreed either that you should recover, or that you should not recover; and therefore it is in vain that you call in a physician." Now with this argument the following may be wittily compared: "If it is decreed that you should beget children, you will beget them, whether you have intercourse with a woman or not. But if it is decreed that you should not beget children, you will not do so, whether you have intercourse with a woman or no. Now, certainly, it is decreed either that you should beget children or not; therefore it is in vain that you have intercourse with a woman." For, as in the latter instance, intercourse with a woman is not employed in vain, seeing it is an utter impossibility for him who does not use it to beget children; so, in the former, if recovery from disease is to be accomplished by means of the healing art, of necessity the physician is summoned, and it is therefore false to say that "in vain do you call in a physician." We have brought forward all these illustrations on account of the assertion of this learned Celsus, that "being a God he predicted these things, and the predictions must *by all means* come to pass." Now, if by "*by all means*" he means "*necessarily*," we cannot admit this. For it was quite possible, also, that they might *not* come to pass. But if he uses "*by all means*" in the sense of "*simple futurity*,"[1] which nothing hinders from being true (although it was possible that they might not happen), he does not at all touch my argument; nor did it follow, from Jesus having predicted the acts of the traitor or the perjurer, that it was the same thing with His being the cause of such impious and unholy proceedings. For He who was amongst us, and knew what was in man, seeing his evil disposition, and foreseeing what he would attempt from his spirit of covetousness, and from his want of stable ideas of duty towards his Master, along with many other declarations, gave utterance to this also: "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me."[2]

Chapter XXI.

Observe also the superficiality and manifest falsity of such

[1] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔσται. [2] Matt. xxvi. 23.

a statement of Celsus, when he asserts "that he who was partaker of a man's table would not conspire against him; and if he would not conspire against a man, much less would he plot against a God after banqueting with him." For who does not know that many persons, after partaking of the salt on the table,[1] have entered into a conspiracy against their entertainers? The whole of Greek and barbarian history is full of such instances. And the Iambic poet of Paros,[2] when upbraiding Lycambes with having violated covenants confirmed by the salt of the table, says to him:

"But thou hast broken a mighty oath—that, viz., by the salt of the table."

And they who are interested in historical learning, and who give themselves wholly to it, to the neglect of other branches of knowledge more necessary for the conduct of life,[3] can quote numerous instances, showing that they who shared in the hospitality of others entered into conspiracies against them.

Chapter xxii.

He adds to this, as if he had brought together an argument with conclusive demonstrations and consequences, the following: "And, which is still more absurd, God himself conspired against those who sat at his table, by converting them into traitors and impious men." But how Jesus could either conspire or convert His disciples into traitors or impious men, it would be impossible for him to prove, save by means of such a deduction as any one could refute with the greatest ease.

Chapter xxiii.

He continues in this strain: "If he had determined upon these things, and underwent chastisement in obedience to his Father, it is manifest that, being a God, and submitting voluntarily, those things that were done agreeably to his own decision were neither painful nor distressing." But he did not observe that here he was at once contradicting himself. For if he granted that He was chastised because He had determined upon these things, and had submitted Himself to His Father, it is clear that He actually suffered punishment, and it

[1] ἁλῶν καὶ τραπέζης.

[2] Archilochus.

[3] Guietus would expunge these words as "inept."

was impossible that what was inflicted on Him by His chastisers should not be painful, because pain is an involuntary thing. But if, because He was willing to suffer, His inflictions were neither painful nor distressing, how did He grant that "He was chastised?" He did not perceive that when Jesus had once, by His birth, assumed a body, He assumed one which was capable both of suffering pains, and those distresses incidental to humanity, if we are to understand by distresses what no one voluntarily chooses. Since, therefore, He voluntarily assumed a body, not wholly of a different nature from that of human flesh, so along with His body He assumed also its sufferings and distresses, which it was not in His power to avoid enduring, it being in the power of those who inflicted them to send upon Him things distressing and painful. And in the preceding pages we have already shown, that He would not have come into the hands of men had He not so willed. But He did come, because He was willing to come, and because it was manifest beforehand that His dying upon behalf of men would be of advantage to the whole human race.

Chapter XXIV.

After this, wishing to prove that the occurrences which befell Him were painful and distressing, and that it was impossible for Him, had He wished, to render them otherwise, he proceeds: "Why does he mourn, and lament, and pray to escape the fear of death, expressing himself in terms like these: 'O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me?'"[1] Now in these words observe the malignity of Celsus, how not accepting the love of truth which actuates the writers of the Gospels (who might have passed over in silence those points which, as Celsus thinks, are censurable, but who did not omit them for many reasons, which any one, in expounding the Gospel, can give in their proper place), he brings an accusation against the Gospel statement, grossly exaggerating the facts, and quoting what is not written in the Gospels, seeing it is nowhere found that Jesus lamented. And he changes the words in the expression, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and does not give what follows immediately after, which manifests at

[1] Matt. xxvi. 39.

once the ready obedience of Jesus to His Father, and His greatness of mind, and which runs thus: "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt."[1] Nay, even the cheerful obedience of Jesus to the will of His Father in those things which He was condemned to suffer, exhibited in the declaration, "If this cup cannot pass from me except I drink it, Thy will be done," he pretends not to have observed, acting here like those wicked individuals who listen to the Holy Scriptures in a malignant spirit, and "who talk wickedness with lofty head." For they appear to have heard the declaration, "I kill,"[2] and they often make it to us a subject of reproach; but the words, "I will make alive," they do not remember,—the whole sentence showing that those who live amid public wickedness, and who work wickedly, are put to death by God, and that a better life is infused into them instead, even one which God will give to those who have died to sin. And so also these men have heard the words, "I will smite;" but they do not see these, "and I will heal," which are like the words of a physician, who cuts bodies asunder, and inflicts severe wounds, in order to extract from them substances that are injurious and prejudicial to health, and who does not terminate his work with pains and lacerations, but by his treatment restores the body to that state of soundness which he has in view. Moreover, they have not heard the whole of the announcement, "For He maketh sore, and again bindeth up;" but only this part, "He maketh sore." So in like manner acts this Jew of Celsus, who quotes the words, "O Father, would that this cup might pass from me;" but who does not add what follows, and which exhibits the firmness of Jesus, and His preparedness for suffering. But these matters, which afford great room for explanation from the wisdom of God, and which may reasonably be pondered over[3] by those whom Paul calls "perfect" when he said, "We speak wisdom among them who are perfect,"[4] we pass by for the present, and shall speak for a little of those matters which are useful for our present purpose.

[1] Matt. xxvi. 39. [2] Deut. xxxii. 39.

[3] *καὶ ταῦτα δέ, πολλὴν ἔχοντα διήγησιν ἀπὸ σοφίας Θεοῦ οἷς ὁ Παῦλος ὠνόμασε τελείοις εὐλόγως παραδοθησομένην.*

[4] 1 Cor. ii. 6.

Chapter XXV.

We have mentioned in the preceding pages that there are some of the declarations of Jesus which refer to that Being in Him which was the "first-born of every creature," such as, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life," and such like; and others, again, which belong to that in Him which is understood to be man, such as, "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth which I have heard of the Father."[1] And here, accordingly, he describes the element of weakness belonging to human flesh, and that of readiness of spirit which existed in His humanity: the element of weakness in the expression, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" the readiness of the spirit in this, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." And since it is proper to observe the order of our quotations, observe that, in the first place, there is mentioned only the single instance, as one would say, indicating the weakness of the flesh; and afterwards those other instances, greater in number, manifesting the willingness of the spirit. For the expression, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," is only one: whereas more numerous are those others, viz., "Not as I will, but as Thou wilt;" and, "O my Father, if this cup cannot pass from me except I drink it, Thy will be done." It is to be noted also, that the words are not, "let this cup depart from me;" but that the whole expression is marked by a tone of piety and reverence, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." I know, indeed, that there is another explanation of this passage to the following effect:—The Saviour, foreseeing the sufferings which the Jewish people and the city of Jerusalem were to undergo in requital of the wicked deeds which the Jews had dared to perpetrate upon Him, from no other motive than that of the purest philanthropy towards them, and from a desire that they might escape the impending calamities, gave utterance to the prayer, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." It is as if He had said, "Because of my drinking this cup of punishment, the whole nation will be forsaken by Thee, I pray, if it be possible, that this cup may pass from me, in order that Thy portion, which was guilty of

[1] John viii. 40.

such crimes against me, may not be altogether deserted by Thee." But if, as Celsus would allege, "nothing at that time was done to Jesus which was either painful or distressing," how could men afterwards quote the example of Jesus as enduring sufferings for the sake of religion, if He did *not* suffer what are human sufferings, but only had the *appearance* of so doing?

Chapter XXVI.

This Jew of Celsus still accuses the disciples of Jesus of having invented these statements, saying to them: "Even although guilty of falsehood, ye have not been able to give a colour of credibility to your inventions." In answer to which we have to say, that there was an easy method of concealing these occurrences,—that, viz., of not recording them at all. For if the Gospels had not contained the accounts of these things, who could have reproached us with Jesus having spoken such words during His stay upon the earth? Celsus, indeed, did not see that it was an inconsistency for the same persons both to be deceived regarding Jesus, believing Him to be God, and the subject of prophecy, and to invent fictions about Him, knowing manifestly that these statements were false. Of a truth, therefore, they were not guilty of inventing untruths, but such were their real impressions, and they recorded them truly; or else they were guilty of falsifying the histories, and did not entertain these views, and were not deceived when they acknowledged Him to be God.

Chapter XXVII.

After this he says, that certain of the Christian believers, like persons who in a fit of drunkenness lay violent hands upon themselves, have corrupted the Gospel from its original integrity, to a threefold, and fourfold, and many-fold degree, and have remodelled it, so that they might be able to answer objections. Now I know of no others who have altered the Gospel, save the followers of Marcion, and those of Valentinus, and, I think, also those of Lucian. But such an allegation is no charge against the Christian system, but against those who dared so to trifle with the Gospels. And as it is no ground of accusation against philosophy, that there exist Sophists, or

Epicureans, or Peripatetics, or any others, whoever they may be, who hold false opinions; so neither is it against genuine Christianity that there are some who corrupt the Gospel histories, and who introduce heresies opposed to the meaning of the doctrine of Jesus.

Chapter xxviii.

And since this Jew of Celsus makes it a subject of reproach that Christians should make use of the prophets, who predicted the events of Christ's life, we have to say, in addition to what we have already advanced upon this head, that it became him to spare individuals, as he says, and to expound the prophecies themselves; and after admitting the probability of the Christian interpretation of them, to show how the use which they make of them may be overturned.[1] For in this way he would not appear hastily to assume so important a position on small grounds, and particularly when he asserts that the "prophecies agree with ten thousand other things more credibly than with Jesus." And he ought to have carefully met this powerful argument of the Christians, as being the strongest which they adduce, and to have demonstrated with regard to each particular prophecy, that it can apply to other events with greater probability than to Jesus. He did not, however, perceive that this was a plausible argument to be advanced against the Christians only by one who was an opponent of the prophetic writings; but Celsus has here put in the mouth of a Jew an objection which a Jew would not have made. For a Jew will not admit that the prophecies may be applied to countless other things with greater probability than to Jesus; but he will endeavour, after giving what appears to him the meaning of each, to oppose the Christian interpretation, not indeed by any means adducing convincing reasons, but only attempting to do so.

[1] The original here is probably corrupt: Ὅτι ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν (ὥς φησιν) φειδόμενον ἀνθρώπων αὐτὰς ἐκθέσθαι τὰς προφητείας, καὶ συναγορεύσαντα ταῖς πιθανότησιν αὐτῶν, τὴν φαινομένην αὐτῶν ἀνατροπὴν τῆς χρήσεως τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκθέσθαι. For φειδόμενον Boherellus would read κηδόμενον, and τὴν φαινομένην αὐτῷ ἀνατροπήν.

Chapter xxix.

In the preceding pages we have already spoken of this point, viz. the prediction that there were to be two advents of Christ to the human race, so that it is not necessary for us to reply to the objection, supposed to be urged by a Jew, that "the prophets declare the coming one to be a mighty potentate, Lord of all nations and armies." But it is in the spirit of a Jew, I think, and in keeping with their bitter animosity, and baseless and even improbable calumnies against Jesus, that he adds: "Nor did the prophets predict such a pestilence."[1] For neither Jews, nor Celsus, nor any other, can bring any argument to prove that a pestilence converts men from the practice of evil to a life which is according to nature, and distinguished by temperance and other virtues.

Chapter xxx.

This objection also is cast in our teeth by Celsus: "From such signs and misinterpretations, and from proofs so mean, no one could prove him to be God, and the Son of God." Now it was his duty to enumerate the alleged misinterpretations, and to prove them to be such, and to show by reasoning the meanness of the evidence, in order that the Christian, if any of his objections should seem to be plausible, might be able to answer and confute his arguments. What he said, however, regarding Jesus, did indeed come to pass, because He was a mighty potentate, although Celsus refuses to see that it so happened, notwithstanding that the clearest evidence proves it true of Jesus. "For as the sun," he says, "which enlightens all other objects, first makes himself visible, so ought the Son of God to have done." We would say in reply, that so He did; for righteousness has arisen in His days, and there is abundance of peace, which took its commencement at His birth, God preparing the nations for His teaching, that they might be under one prince, the king of the Romans, and that it might not, owing to the want of union among the nations, caused by the existence of many kingdoms, be more difficult for the apostles of Jesus to accomplish the task enjoined upon them by their

[1] ὄλεθρον.

Master, when He said, "Go and teach all nations." Moreover it is certain that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, who, so to speak, fused together into one monarchy the many populations of the earth. Now the existence of many kingdoms would have been a hindrance to the spread of the doctrine of Jesus throughout the entire world; not only for the reasons mentioned, but also on account of the necessity of men everywhere engaging in war, and fighting on behalf of their native country, which was the case before the times of Augustus, and in periods still more remote, when necessity arose, as when the Peloponnesians and Athenians warred against each other, and other nations in like manner. How, then, was it possible for the gospel doctrine of peace, which does not permit men to take vengeance even upon enemies, to prevail throughout the world, unless at the advent of Jesus a milder spirit had been everywhere introduced into the conduct of things?

Chapter XXXI.

He next charges the Christians with being "guilty of sophistical reasoning, in saying that the Son of God is the Logos Himself." And he thinks that he strengthens the accusation, because "when we declare the Logos to be the Son of God, we do not present to view a pure and holy Logos, but a most degraded man, who was punished by scourging and crucifixion." Now, on this head we have briefly replied to the charges of Celsus in the preceding pages, where Christ was shown to be the first-born of all creation, who assumed a body and a human soul; and that God gave commandment respecting the creation of such mighty things in the world, and they were created; and that He who received the command was God the Logos. And seeing it is a Jew who makes these statements in the work of Celsus, it will not be out of place to quote the declaration, "He sent His word, and healed them, and delivered them from their destruction,"[1]—a passage of which we spoke a little ago. Now, although I have conferred with many Jews who professed to be learned men, I never heard any one expressing his approval of the statement that the Logos is the Son of God, as Celsus declares they do, in putting into

[1] Ps. cvi. 20.

the mouth of the Jew such a declaration as this: "If your Logos is the Son of God, we also give our assent to the same."

Chapter XXXII.

We have already shown that Jesus can be regarded neither as an arrogant man, nor a sorcerer; and therefore it is unnecessary to repeat our former arguments, lest, in replying to the tautologies of Celsus, we ourselves should be guilty of needless repetition. And now, in finding fault with our Lord's genealogy, there are certain points which occasion some difficulty even to Christians, and which, owing to the discrepancy between the genealogies, are advanced by some as arguments against their correctness, but which Celsus has not even mentioned. For Celsus, who is truly a braggart, and who professes to be acquainted with all matters relating to Christianity, does not know how to raise doubts in a skilful manner against the credibility of Scripture. But he asserts that the "framers of the genealogies, from a feeling of pride, made Jesus to be descended from the first man, and from the kings of the Jews." And he thinks that he makes a notable charge when he adds, that "the carpenter's wife could not have been ignorant of the fact, had she been of such illustrious descent." But what has this to do with the question? Granted that she was not ignorant of her descent, how does that affect the result? Suppose that she *were* ignorant, how could her ignorance prove that she was not descended from the first man, or could not derive her origin from the Jewish kings? Does Celsus imagine that the poor must always be descended from ancestors who are poor, or that kings are always born of kings? But it appears folly to waste time upon such an argument as this, seeing it is well known that, even in our own days, some who are poorer than Mary are descended from ancestors of wealth and distinction, and that rulers of nations and kings have sprung from persons of no reputation.

Chapter XXXIII.

"But," continues Celsus, "what great deeds did Jesus perform as being a God? Did he put his enemies to shame, or bring to a ridiculous conclusion what was designed against

him?" Now to this question, although we are able to show the striking and miraculous character of the events which befell Him, yet from what other source can we furnish an answer than from the Gospel narratives, which state that "there was an earthquake, and that the rocks were split asunder, and the tombs opened, and the veil of the temple rent in twain from top to bottom, and that darkness prevailed in the day-time, the sun failing to give light?"[1] But if Celsus believe the Gospel accounts when he thinks that he can find in them matter of charge against the Christians, and refuse to believe them when they establish the divinity of Jesus, our answer to him is: "Sir,[2] either disbelieve all the Gospel narratives, and then no longer imagine that you can found charges upon them; or, in yielding your belief to their statements, look in admiration on the Logos of God, who became incarnate, and who desired to confer benefits upon the whole human race. And this feature evinces the nobility of the work of Jesus, that, down to the present time, those whom God wills are healed by His name. And with regard to the eclipse in the time of Tiberius Cæsar, in whose reign Jesus appears to have been crucified, and the great earthquakes which then took place, Phlegon too, I think, has written in the thirteenth or fourteenth book of his Chronicles."[3]

Chapter xxxiv.

This Jew of Celsus, ridiculing Jesus, as he imagines, is described as being acquainted with the Bacchæ of Euripides, in which Dionysus says:

> "The divinity himself will liberate me whenever I wish."[4]

Now the Jews are not much acquainted with Greek literature; but suppose that there was a Jew so well versed in it [as to make such a quotation on his part appropriate], how [does it follow] that Jesus *could* not liberate Himself, because He did not do so? For let him believe from our own Scriptures that

[1] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 51, 52; cf. Luke xxiii. 44, 45.

[2] ὦ οὗτος.

[3] On Phlegon, cf. note in Migne, pp. 823, 854.

[4] Eurip. *Bacchæ*, v. 498 (ed. Dindorf).

Peter obtained his freedom after having been bound in prison, an angel having loosed his chains; and that Paul, having been bound in the stocks along with Silas in Philippi of Macedonia, was liberated by divine power, when the gates of the prison were opened. But it is probable that Celsus treats these accounts with ridicule, or that he never read them; for he would probably say in reply, that there are certain sorcerers who are able by incantations to unloose chains and to open doors, so that he would liken the events related in our histories to the doings of sorcerers. "But," he continues, "no calamity happened even to him who condemned him, as there did to Pentheus, viz. madness or discerption."[1] And yet he does not know that it was not so much Pilate that condemned Him (who knew that "for envy the Jews had delivered Him"), as the Jewish nation, which *has* been condemned by God, and rent in pieces, and dispersed over the whole earth, in a degree far beyond what happened to Pentheus. Moreover, why did he intentionally omit what is related of Pilate's wife, who beheld a vision, and who was so moved by it as to send a message to her husband, saying: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him?"[2] And again, passing by in silence the proofs of the divinity of Jesus, Celsus endeavours to cast reproach upon Him from the narratives in the Gospel, referring to those who mocked Jesus, and put on Him the purple robe, and the crown of thorns, and placed the reed in His hand. From what source now, Celsus, did you derive these statements, save from the Gospel narratives? And did you, accordingly, see that they were fit matters for reproach, while they who recorded them did not think that you, and such as you, would turn them into ridicule; but that others would receive from them an example how to despise those who ridiculed and mocked Him on account of His religion, who appropriately laid down His life for its sake? Admire rather their love of truth, and that of the Being who bore these things voluntarily for the sake of men, and who endured them with all constancy and long-suffering. For it is not recorded that He uttered any lamentation, or that after His condemnation He either did or uttered anything unbecoming.

[1] Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* b. ii. c. vii. [2] Matt. xxvii. 19.

Chapter XXXV.

But in answer to this objection, "If not before, yet why now, at least, does he not give some manifestation of his divinity, and free himself from this reproach, and take vengeance upon those who insult both him and his Father?" We have to reply, that it would be the same thing as if we were to say to those among the Greeks who accept the doctrine of providence, and who believe in portents, Why does God not punish those who insult the Divinity, and subvert the doctrine of providence? For as the Greeks would answer such objections, so would we, in the same, or a more effective manner. There was not only a portent from heaven—the eclipse of the sun—but also the other miracles, which show that the crucified One possessed something that was divine, and greater than was possessed by the majority of men.

Chapter XXXVI.

Celsus next says: "What is the nature of the ichor in the body of the crucified Jesus? Is it 'such as flows in the bodies of the immortal gods?'"[1] He puts this question in a spirit of mockery; but we shall show from the serious narratives of the Gospels, although Celsus may not like it, that it was no mythic and Homeric ichor which flowed from the body of Jesus, but that, after His death, "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and there came thereout blood and water. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith the truth."[2] Now, in other dead bodies the blood congeals, and pure water does not flow forth; but the miraculous feature in the case of the dead body of Jesus was, that around the dead body blood and water flowed forth from the side. But if this Celsus, who, in order to find matter of accusation against Jesus and the Christians, extracts from the Gospel even passages which are incorrectly interpreted, but passes over in silence the evidences of the divinity of Jesus, would listen to divine portents, let him read the Gospel, and see that even the centurion, and they who with him kept watch over Jesus, on seeing the earthquake, and the

[1] Cf. *Iliad*, vi. 340. [2] Cf. John xix. 34, 35.

events that occurred, were greatly afraid, saying, "This man was the son of God."[1]

Chapter XXXVII.

After this, he who extracts from the Gospel narrative those statements on which he thinks he can found an accusation, makes the vinegar and the gall a subject of reproach to Jesus, saying that "he rushed with open mouth[2] to drink of them, and could not endure his thirst as any ordinary man frequently endures it." Now this matter admits of an explanation of a peculiar and figurative kind; but on the present occasion, the statement that the prophets predicted this very incident may be accepted as the more common answer to the objection. For in the sixty-ninth Psalm there is written, with reference to Christ: "And they gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink."[3] Now, let the Jews say who it is that the prophetic writing represents as uttering these words; and let them adduce from history one who received gall for his food, and to whom vinegar was given as drink. Would they venture to assert that the Christ whom they expect still to come might be placed in such circumstances? Then we would say, What prevents the prediction from having been already accomplished? For this very prediction was uttered many ages before, and is sufficient, along with the other prophetic utterances, to lead him who fairly examines the whole matter to the conclusion that Jesus is He who was prophesied of as Christ, and as the Son of God.

Chapter XXXVIII.

The Jew next remarks: "You, O sincere believers,[4] find fault with us, because we do not recognise this individual as God, nor agree with you that he endured these [sufferings] for the benefit of mankind, in order that we also might despise punishment." Now, in answer to this, we say that we blame the Jews, who have been brought up under the training of the law and the prophets (which foretell the coming of Christ), because they neither refute the arguments which we lay before them to prove that He is the Messiah,[5] adducing such refuta-

[1] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 54.
[2] χανδόν.
[3] Ps. lxix. 21.
[4] ὦ πιστότατοι.
[5] τὸν Χριστόν.

tion as a defence of their unbelief; nor yet, while not offering any refutation, do they believe in Him who was the subject of prophecy, and who clearly manifested through His disciples, even after the period of His appearance in the flesh, that He underwent these things for the benefit of mankind; having, as the object of His first advent, not to condemn men and their actions[1] before He had instructed them, and pointed out to them their duty,[2] nor to chastise the wicked and save the good, but to disseminate His doctrine in an extraordinary[3] manner, and with the evidence of divine power, among the whole human race, as the prophets also have represented these things. And we blame them, moreover, because they did not believe in Him who gave evidence of the power that was in Him, but asserted that He cast out demons from the souls of men through Beelzebub the prince of the demons; and we blame them because they slander the philanthropic character of Him, who overlooked not only no city, but not even a single village in Judea, that He might everywhere announce the kingdom of God, accusing Him of leading the wandering life of a vagabond, and passing an anxious existence in a disgraceful body. But there is no disgrace in enduring such labours for the benefit of all those who may be able to understand Him.

Chapter xxxix.

And how can the following assertion of this Jew of Celsus appear anything else than a manifest falsehood, viz. that Jesus "having gained over no one during his life, not even his own disciples, underwent these punishments and sufferings?" For from what other source sprang the envy which was aroused against Him by the Jewish high priests, and elders, and scribes, save from the fact that multitudes obeyed and followed Him, and were led into the deserts not only by the persuasive[4] language of Him whose words were always appropriate to His hearers, but who also by His miracles made an impression on those who were not moved to belief by His words? And is it not a manifest falsehood to say that "he did not gain over even his own disciples," who exhibited, indeed, at that time some

[1] τὰ ἀνθρώπων.
[2] μαρτύρασθαι περὶ τῶν πρακτέων.
[3] παραδόξως.
[4] τῆς τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀκολουθίας.

symptoms of human weakness arising from cowardly fear—for they had not yet been disciplined to the exhibition of full courage—but who by no means abandoned the judgments which they had formed regarding Him as the Christ? For Peter, after his denial, perceiving to what a depth of wickedness he had fallen, "went out and wept bitterly;" while the others, although stricken with dismay on account of what had happened to Jesus (for they still continued to admire Him), had, by His glorious appearance,[1] their belief more firmly established than before that He was the Son of God.

Chapter XL.

It is, moreover, in a very unphilosophical spirit that Celsus imagines our Lord's pre-eminence among men to consist, not in the preaching of salvation and in a pure morality, but in acting contrary to the character of that personality which He had taken upon Him, and in not dying, although He had assumed mortality; or, if dying, yet at least not such a death as might serve as a pattern to those who were to learn by that very act how to die for the sake of religion, and to comport themselves boldly through its help, before those who hold erroneous views on the subject of religion and irreligion, and who regard religious men as altogether irreligious, but imagine those to be most religious who err regarding God, and who apply to everything rather than to God the ineradicable[2] idea of Him [which is implanted in the human mind], and especially when they eagerly rush to destroy those who have yielded themselves up with their whole soul (even unto death), to the clear evidence of one God who is over all things.

Chapter XLI.

In the person of the Jew, Celsus continues to find fault with Jesus, alleging that "he did not show himself to be pure from all evil." Let Celsus state from what "evil" our Lord did not show Himself to be pure. If he means that He was not pure from what is properly termed "evil," let him clearly prove the existence of any wicked work in Him. But if he deems poverty and the cross to be evils, and conspiracy on the part of wicked men, then it is clear that he would say that evil

[1] ἐπιφανείας. [2] τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀδιάστροφον ἔννοιαν.

had happened also to Socrates, who was unable to show himself pure from evils. And how great also the other band of poor men is among the Greeks, who have given themselves to philosophical pursuits, and have voluntarily accepted a life of poverty, is known to many among the Greeks from what is recorded of Democritus, who allowed his property to become pasture for sheep; and of Crates, who obtained his freedom by bestowing upon the Thebans the price received for the sale of his possessions. Nay, even Diogenes himself, from excessive poverty, came to live in a tub; and yet, in the opinion of no one possessed of moderate understanding, was Diogenes on that account considered to be in an evil (sinful) condition.

Chapter XLII.

But further, since Celsus will have it that "Jesus was not irreproachable," let him instance any one of those who adhere to His doctrine, who has recorded anything that could truly furnish ground of reproach against Jesus; or if it be not from these that he derives his matter of accusation against Him, let him say from what quarter he has learned that which has induced him to say that He is not free from reproach. Jesus, however, performed all that He promised to do, and by which He conferred benefits upon His adherents. And we, continually seeing fulfilled all that was predicted by Him before it happened, viz. that this gospel of His should be preached throughout the whole world, and that His disciples should go among all nations and announce His doctrine; and, moreover, that they should be brought before governors and kings on no other account than because of His teaching; we are lost in wonder at Him, and have our faith in Him daily confirmed. And I know not by what greater or more convincing proofs Celsus would have Him confirm His predictions; unless, indeed, as seems to be the case, not understanding that the Logos had become the man Jesus, he would have Him to be subject to no human weakness, nor to become an illustrious pattern to men of the manner in which they ought to bear the calamities of life, although these appear to Celsus to be most lamentable and disgraceful occurrences, seeing that he regards labour[1] to

[1] πόνον.

be the greatest of evils, and pleasure the perfect good,—a view accepted by none of those philosophers who admit the doctrine of providence, and who allow that courage, and fortitude, and magnanimity are virtues. Jesus, therefore, by His sufferings cast no discredit upon the faith of which He was the object; but rather confirmed the same among those who would approve of manly courage, and among those who were taught by Him that what was truly and properly the happy life was not here below, but was to be found in that which was called, according to His own words, the "coming world;" whereas in what is called the "present world" life is a calamity, or at least the first and greatest struggle of the soul.[1]

Chapter xliii.

Celsus next addresses to us the following remark: "You will not, I suppose, say of him, that, after failing to gain over those who were in this world, he went to Hades to gain over those who were there." But whether he like it or not, we assert that not only while Jesus was in the body did He win over not a few persons merely, but so great a number, that a conspiracy was formed against Him on account of the multitude of His followers; but also, that when He became a soul, without the covering of the body, He dwelt among those souls which were without bodily covering, converting such of them as were willing to Himself, or those whom He saw, for reasons known to Him alone, to be better adapted to such a course.

Chapter xliv.

Celsus in the next place says, with indescribable silliness: "If, after inventing defences which are absurd, and by which ye were ridiculously deluded, ye imagine that you really make a good defence, what prevents you from regarding those other individuals who have been condemned, and have died a miserable death, as greater and more divine messengers of heaven [than Jesus]?" Now, that manifestly and clearly there is no similarity between Jesus, who suffered what is described, and those who have died a wretched death on account of their sorcery, or whatever else be the charge against them, is patent

[1] ἀγῶνα τὸν πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον τῆς ψυχῆς.

to every one. For no one can point to any acts of a sorcerer which turned away souls from the practice of the many sins which prevail among men, and from the flood of wickedness (in the world).[1] But since this Jew of Celsus compares Him to robbers, and says that "any similarly shameless fellow might be able to say regarding even a robber and murderer whom punishment had overtaken, that such an one was not a robber, but a god, because he predicted to his fellow-robbers that he would suffer such punishment as he actually did suffer," it might, in the first place, be answered, that it is not because He predicted that He would suffer such things that we entertain those opinions regarding Jesus which lead us to have confidence in Him, as one who has come down to us from God. And, in the second place, we assert that this very comparison[2] has been somehow foretold in the Gospels; since God was numbered with the transgressors by wicked men, who desired rather a "murderer" (one who for sedition and murder had been cast into prison) to be released unto them, and Jesus to be crucified, and who crucified Him between two robbers. Jesus, indeed, is ever crucified with robbers among His genuine disciples and witnesses to the truth, and suffers the same condemnation which they do among men. And we say, that if those persons have any resemblance to robbers, who on account of their piety towards God suffer all kinds of injury and death, that they may keep it pure and unstained, according to the teaching of Jesus, then it is clear also that Jesus, the author of such teaching, is with good reason compared by Celsus to the captain of a band of robbers. But neither was He who died for the common good of mankind, nor they who suffered because of their religion, and alone of all men were persecuted because of what appeared to them the right way of honouring God, put to death in accordance with justice, nor was Jesus persecuted without the charge of impiety being incurred by His persecutors.

Chapter XLV.

But observe the superficial nature of his argument respecting the former disciples of Jesus, in which he says: "In the next place, those who were his associates while alive, and who

[1] τῆς κατὰ τὴν κακίαν φύσεως. [2] καὶ ταῦτα.

listened to his voice, and enjoyed his instructions as their teacher, on seeing him subjected to punishment and death, neither died with him, nor for him, nor were even induced to regard punishment with contempt, but denied even that they were his disciples, whereas now ye die along with him." And here he believes the sin which was committed by the disciples while they were yet beginners and imperfect, and which is recorded in the Gospels, to have been actually committed, in order that he may have matter of accusation against the gospel; but their upright conduct after their transgression, when they behaved with courage before the Jews, and suffered countless cruelties at their hands, and at last suffered death for the doctrine of Jesus, he passes by in silence. For he would neither hear the words of Jesus, when He predicted to Peter, "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands,"[1] etc., to which the Scripture adds, "This spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God;" nor how James the brother of John—an apostle, the brother of an apostle—was slain with the sword by Herod for the doctrine of Christ; nor even the many instances of boldness displayed by Peter and the other apostles because of the gospel, and "how they went forth from the presence of the Sanhedrim after being scourged, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name,"[2] and so surpassing many of the instances related by the Greeks of the fortitude and courage of their philosophers. From the very beginning, then, this was inculcated as a precept of Jesus among His hearers, which taught men to despise the life which is eagerly sought after by the multitude, but to be earnest in living the life which resembles that of God.

Chapter xlvi.

But how can this Jew of Celsus escape the charge of falsehood, when he says that Jesus, "when on earth, gained over to himself only ten sailors and tax-gatherers of the most worthless character, and not even the whole of these?" Now it is certain that the Jews themselves would admit that He drew over not ten persons merely, nor a hundred, nor a thousand, but

[1] John xxi. 18. [2] Acts v. 41.

on one occasion five thousand at once, and on another four thousand; and that He attracted them to such a degree that they followed Him even into the deserts, which alone could contain the assembled multitude of those who believed in God through Jesus, and where He not only addressed to them discourses, but also manifested to them His works. And now, through his tautology, he compels us also to be tautological, since we are careful to guard against being supposed to pass over any of the charges advanced by him; and therefore, in reference to the matter before us, following the order of his treatise as we have it, he says: "Is it not the height of absurdity to maintain, that if, while he himself was alive, he won over not a single person to his views, after his death any who wish are able to gain over such a multitude of individuals?" Whereas he ought to have said, in consistency with truth, that if, after His death, not simply those who will, but they who have the will and the power, can gain over so many proselytes, how much more consonant to reason is it, that while He was alive He should, through the greater power of His words and deeds, have won over to Himself manifold greater numbers of adherents?

Chapter XLVII.

He represents, moreover, a statement of his own as if it were an answer to one of his questions, in which he asks: "By what train of argument were you led to regard him as the Son of God?" For he makes us answer that "we were won over to him, because[1] we know that his punishment was undergone to bring about the destruction of the father of evil." Now we were won over to His doctrine by innumerable other considerations, of which we have stated only the smallest part in the preceding pages; but, if God permit, we shall continue to enumerate them, not only while dealing with the so-called *True Discourse* of Celsus, but also on many other occasions. And, as if we said that we consider Him to be the Son of God because He suffered punishment, he asks: "What then? have not many others, too, been punished, and that not less disgrace-

[1] The reading in the text is *εἰ καὶ ἴσμεν*; for which both Bohereau and De la Rue propose *ἐπεὶ ἴσμεν*, which has been adopted in the translation: cf. *ἐπεὶ ἐκολάσθη*, *infra*.

fully?" And here Celsus acts like the most contemptible enemies of the gospel, and like those who imagine that it follows as a consequence from our history of the crucified Jesus, that we should worship those who have undergone crucifixion!

Chapter xlviii.

Celsus, moreover, unable to resist the miracles which Jesus is recorded to have performed, has already on several occasions spoken of them slanderously as works of sorcery; and we also on several occasions have, to the best of our ability, replied to his statements. And now he represents us as saying that "we deemed Jesus to be the Son of God, because he healed the lame and the blind." And he adds: "Moreover, as you assert, he raised the dead." That He healed the lame and the blind, and that therefore we hold Him to be the Christ and the Son of God, is manifest to us from what is contained in the prophecies: "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear; then shall the lame man leap as an hart."[1] And that He also raised the dead, and that it is no fiction of those who composed the Gospels, is shown by this, that if it had been a fiction, *many* individuals would have been represented as having risen from the dead, and these, too, such as had been many years in their graves. But as it is no fiction, they are very easily counted of whom this is related to have happened; viz. the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue (of whom I know not why He said, "She is not dead, but sleepeth," stating regarding her something which does not apply to all who die); and the only son of the widow, on whom He took compassion and raised him up, making the bearers of the corpse to stand still; and the third instance, that of Lazarus, who had been four days in the grave. Now, regarding these cases we would say to all persons of candid mind, and especially to the Jew, that as there were many lepers in the days of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was healed save Naaman the Syrian, and many widows in the days of Elijah the prophet, to none of whom was Elijah sent save to Sarepta in Sidonia (for the widow there had been deemed worthy by a divine decree of the miracle which was wrought by the pro-

[1] Cf. Isa. xxxv. 5, 6.

phet in the matter of the bread); so also there were many dead in the days of Jesus, but those only rose from the grave whom the Logos knew to be fitted for a resurrection, in order that the works done by the Lord might not be merely symbols of certain things, but that by the very acts themselves He might gain over many to the marvellous doctrine of the gospel. I would say, moreover, that, agreeably to the promise of Jesus, His disciples performed even greater works than these miracles of Jesus, which were perceptible only to the senses.[1] For the eyes of those who are blind in soul are ever opened; and the ears of those who were deaf to virtuous words, listen readily to the doctrine of God, and of the blessed life with Him; and many, too, who were lame in the feet of the "inner man," as Scripture calls it, having now been healed by the word, do not simply leap, but leap as the hart, which is an animal hostile to serpents, and stronger than all the poison of vipers. And these lame who have been healed, receive from Jesus power to trample, with those feet in which they were formerly lame, upon the serpents and scorpions of wickedness, and generally upon all the power of the enemy; and though they tread upon it, they sustain no injury, for they also have become stronger than the poison of all evil and of demons.

Chapter xlix.

Jesus, accordingly, in turning away the minds of His disciples, not merely from giving heed to sorcerers in general, and those who profess in any other manner to work miracles—for His disciples did not need to be so warned—but from such as gave themselves out as the Christ of God, and who tried by certain apparent[2] miracles to gain over to them the disciples of Jesus, said in a certain passage: "Then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and

[1] ὧν Ἰησοῦς αἰσθητῶν. [2] φαντασιῶν.

shineth even to the west, so also shall the coming of the Son of man be."[1] And in another passage: "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not eaten and drunk in Thy name, and by Thy name have cast out demons, and done many wonderful works? And then will I say unto them, Depart from me, because ye are workers of iniquity."[2] But Celsus, wishing to assimilate the miracles of Jesus to the works of human sorcery, says in express terms as follows: "O light and truth! he distinctly declares, with his own voice, as ye yourselves have recorded, that there will come to you even others, employing miracles of a similar kind, who are wicked men, and sorcerers; and he calls him who makes use of such devices, one Satan. So that Jesus himself does not deny that these works at least are not at all divine, but are the acts of wicked men; and being compelled by the force of truth, he at the same time not only laid open the doings of others, but convicted himself of the same acts. Is it not, then, a miserable inference, to conclude from the same works that the one is God and the others sorcerers? Why ought the others, because of these acts, to be accounted wicked rather than this man, seeing they have him as their witness against himself? For he has himself acknowledged that these are not the works of a divine nature, but the inventions of certain deceivers, and of thoroughly wicked men." Observe, now, whether Celsus is not clearly convicted of slandering the gospel by such statements, since what Jesus says regarding those who are to work signs and wonders is different from what this Jew of Celsus alleges it to be. For if Jesus had simply told His disciples to be on their guard against those who professed to work miracles, without declaring what they would give themselves out to be, then perhaps there would have been some ground for his suspicion. But since those against whom Jesus would have us to be on our guard give themselves out as the Christ—which is not a claim put forth by sorcerers—and since he says that even some who lead wicked lives will perform miracles in the name of Jesus, and expel demons out of men, sorcery in the case of these individuals, or any suspicion of such, is rather, if we may so

[1] Matt. xxiv. 23–27.

[2] Cf. Matt. vii. 22, 23, with Luke xiii. 26, 27.

speak, altogether banished, and the divinity of Christ established, as well as the divine mission[1] of His disciples; seeing that it is possible that one who makes use of His name, and who is wrought upon by some power, in some way unknown, to make the pretence that he is the Christ, should seem to perform miracles like those of Jesus, while others through His name should do works resembling those of His genuine disciples.

Chapter L.

Paul, moreover, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, shows in what manner there will one day be revealed "the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."[2] And again he says to the Thessalonians: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only He who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way: and then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."[3] And in assigning the reason why the man of sin is permitted to continue in existence, he says: "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."[4] Let any one now say whether any of the statements in the Gospel, or in the writings of the apostle, could give occasion for the suspicion that there is therein contained any prediction of sorcery. Any one, moreover, who likes may find the prophecy in Daniel respecting antichrist.[5] But Celsus falsifies the words of Jesus, since He did not say that others would come working similar miracles to Himself, but who are wicked men and sorcerers, although Celsus asserts that He uttered such words. For as the power

[1] *θειότης*, lit. divinity.
[2] 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.
[3] 2 Thess. ii. 6–10.
[4] 2 Thess. ii. 10–12.
[5] Cf. Dan. vii. 26.

of the Egyptian magicians was not similar to the divinely-bestowed grace of Moses, but the issue clearly proved that the acts of the former were the effect of magic, while those of Moses were wrought by divine power; so the proceedings of the antichrists, and of those who feign that they can work miracles as being the disciples of Christ, are said to be lying signs and wonders, prevailing with all deceivableness of unrighteousness among them that perish; whereas the works of Christ and His disciples had for their fruit, not deceit, but the salvation of human souls. And who would rationally maintain that an improved moral life, which daily lessened the number of a man's offences, could proceed from a system of deceit?

Chapter LI.

Celsus, indeed, evinced a slight knowledge of Scripture when he made Jesus say, that it is "a certain Satan who contrives such devices;" although he begs the question[1] when he asserts that "Jesus did not deny that these works have in them nothing of divinity, but proceed from wicked men," for he makes things which differ in kind to be the same. Now, as a wolf is not of the same species as a dog, although it may appear to have some resemblance in the figure of its body and in its voice, nor a common wood-pigeon[2] the same as a dove,[3] so there is no resemblance between what is done by the power of God and what is the effect of sorcery. And we might further say, in answer to the calumnies of Celsus, Are those to be regarded as miracles which are wrought through sorcery by wicked demons, but those not which are performed by a nature that is holy and divine? and does human life endure the worse, but never receive the better? Now it appears to me that we must lay it down as a general principle, that as, wherever anything that is evil would make itself to be of the same nature with the good, there must by all means be something that is good opposed to the evil; so also, in opposition to those things which are brought about by sorcery, there must also of necessity be some things in human life which are the result of divine power. And it follows from the same, that we must either annihilate both, and assert that neither exists, or, assuming the one, and particularly

[1] συναρπάζει τὸν λόγον. [2] Φάσσα. [3] περιστερά.

the evil, admit also the reality of the good. Now, if one were to lay it down that works are wrought by means of sorcery, but would not grant that there are also works which are the product of divine power, he would seem to me to resemble him who should admit the existence of sophisms and plausible arguments, which have the appearance of establishing the truth, although really undermining it, while denying that truth had anywhere a home among men, or a dialectic which differed from sophistry. But if we once admit that it is consistent with the existence of magic and sorcery (which derive their power from evil demons, who are spell-bound by elaborate incantations, and become subject to sorcerers) that some works must be found among men which proceed from a power that is divine, why shall we not test those who profess to perform them by their lives and morals, and the consequences of their miracles, viz. whether they tend to the injury of men or to the reformation of conduct? What minister of evil demons, *e.g.*, can do such things? and by means of what incantations and magic arts? And who, on the other hand, is it that, having his soul and his spirit, and I imagine also his body, in a pure and holy state, receives a divine spirit, and performs such works in order to benefit men, and to lead them to believe on the true God? But if we must once investigate (without being carried away by the miracles themselves) who it is that performs them by help of a good, and who by help of an evil power, so that we may neither slander all without discrimination, nor yet admire and accept all as divine, will it not be manifest, from what occurred in the times of Moses and Jesus, when entire nations were established in consequence of their miracles, that these men wrought by means of divine power what they are recorded to have performed? For wickedness and sorcery would not have led a whole nation to rise not only above idols and images erected by men, but also above all created things, and to ascend to the uncreated origin of the God of the universe.

Chapter LII.

But since it is a Jew who makes these assertions in the treatise of Celsus, we would say to him: Pray, friend, why do you believe the works which are recorded in your writings as

having been performed by God through the instrumentality of Moses to be really divine, and endeavour to refute those who slanderously assert that they were wrought by sorcery, like those of the Egyptian magicians; while, in imitation of your Egyptian opponents, you charge those which were done by Jesus, and which, you admit, were actually performed, with not being divine? For if the final result, and the founding of an entire nation by the miracles of Moses, manifestly demonstrate that it was God who brought these things to pass in the time of Moses the Hebrew lawgiver, why should not such rather be shown to be the case with Jesus, who accomplished far greater works than those of Moses? For the former took those of his own nation, the descendants of Abraham, who had observed the rite of circumcision transmitted by tradition, and who were careful observers of the Abrahamic usages, and led them out of Egypt, enacting for them those laws which you believe to be divine; whereas the latter ventured upon a greater undertaking, and superinduced upon the pre-existing constitution, and upon ancestral customs and modes of life agreeable to the existing laws, a constitution in conformity with the gospel. And as it was necessary, in order that Moses should find credit not only among the elders, but the common people, that there should be performed those miracles which he is recorded to have performed, why should not Jesus also, in order that He may be believed on by those of the people who had learned to ask for signs and wonders, require to work such miracles as, on account of their greater grandeur and divinity (in comparison with those of Moses), were able to convert men from Jewish fables, and from the human traditions which prevailed among them, and make them admit that He who taught and did such things was greater than the prophets? For how was not He greater than the prophets, who was proclaimed by them to be the Christ, and the Saviour of the human race?

Chapter LIII.

All the arguments, indeed, which this Jew of Celsus advances against those who believe on Jesus, may, by parity of reasoning, be urged as ground of accusation against Moses: so that there is no difference in asserting that the sorcery prac-

tised by Jesus and that by Moses were similar to each other,[1]—both of them, so far as the language of this Jew of Celsus is concerned, being liable to the same charge; as, *e.g.*, when this Jew says of Christ, "But, O light and truth! Jesus with his own voice expressly declares, as you yourselves have recorded, that there will appear among you others also, who will perform miracles like mine, but who are wicked men and sorcerers," some one, either Greek or Egyptian, or any other party who disbelieved the Jew, might say respecting Moses, "But, O light and truth! Moses with his own voice expressly declares, as ye also have recorded, that there will appear among you others also, who will perform miracles like mine, but who are wicked men and sorcerers. For it is written in your law, 'If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken to the words of that prophet or dreamer of dreams,'"[2] etc. Again, perverting the words of Jesus, he says, "And he terms him who devises such things, one Satan;" while one, applying this to Moses, might say, "And he terms him who devises such things, a prophet who dreams dreams." And as this Jew asserts regarding Jesus, that "even he himself does not deny that these works have in them nothing of divinity, but are the acts of wicked men;" so any one who disbelieves the writings of Moses might say, quoting what has been already said, the same thing, viz., that "even Moses does not deny that these works have in them nothing of divinity, but are the acts of wicked men." And he will do the same thing also with respect to this: "Being compelled by the force of truth, Moses at the same time both exposed the doings of others, and convicted himself of the same." And when the Jew says, "Is it not a wretched inference from the same acts, to conclude that the one is a God, and the others sorcerers?" one might object to him, on the ground of those words of Moses already quoted, "Is it not then a wretched inference from

[1] ὥστε μηδὲν διαφέρειν παραπλήσιον εἶναι λέγειν γοητείαν τὴν Ἰησοῦ τῇ Μωϋσέως.

[2] Deut. xiii. 1–3.

the same acts, to conclude that the one is a prophet and servant of God, and the others sorcerers?" But when, in addition to those comparisons which I have already mentioned, Celsus, dwelling upon the subject, adduces this also: "Why from these works should the others be accounted wicked, rather than this man, seeing they have him as a witness against himself?" —we, too, shall adduce the following, in addition to what has been already said: "Why, from those passages in which Moses forbids us to believe those who exhibit signs and wonders, ought we to consider such persons as wicked, rather than Moses, because he calumniates some of them in respect of their signs and wonders?" And urging more to the same effect, that he may appear to strengthen his attempt, he says: "He himself acknowledged that these were not the works of a divine nature, but were the inventions of certain deceivers, and of very wicked men." Who, then, is "himself?" You, O Jew, say that it is Jesus; but he who accuses you as liable to the same charges, will transfer this "himself" to the person of Moses.

Chapter liv.

After this, forsooth, the Jew of Celsus, to keep up the character assigned to the Jew from the beginning, in his address to those of his countrymen who had become believers, says: "By what, then, were you induced [to become his followers]? Was it because he foretold that after his death he would rise again?" Now this question, like the others, can be retorted upon Moses. For we might say to the Jew: "By what, then, were *you* induced [to become the follower of Moses]? Was it because he put on record the following statement about his own death: 'And Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord; and they buried him in Moab, near the house of Phogor: and no one knoweth his sepulchre until this day?'"[1] For as the Jew casts discredit upon the statement, that "Jesus foretold that after His death He would rise again," another person might make a similar assertion about Moses, and would say in reply, that Moses also put on record (for the book of Deuteronomy is his composition) the statement, that "no one

[1] Cf. Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6.

knoweth his sepulchre until this day," in order to magnify and enhance the importance of his place of burial, as being unknown to mankind.

Chapter LV.

The Jew continues his address to those of his countrymen who are converts, as follows: "Come now, let us grant to you that the prediction was actually uttered. Yet how many others are there who practise such juggling tricks, in order to deceive their simple hearers, and who make gain by their deception?—as was the case, they say, with Zamolxis[1] in Scythia, the slave of Pythagoras; and with Pythagoras himself in Italy; and with Rhampsinitus[2] in Egypt (the latter of whom, they say, played at dice with Demeter in Hades, and returned to the upper world with a golden napkin which he had received from her as a gift); and also with Orpheus[3] among the Odrysians, and Protesilaus in Thessaly, and Hercules[4] at Cape Tænarus, and Theseus. But the question is, whether any one who was really dead ever rose with a veritable body.[5] Or do you imagine the statements of others not only to be myths, but to have the appearance of such, while you have discovered a becoming and credible termination to your drama in the voice from the cross, when he breathed his last, and in the earthquake and the darkness? That while alive he was of no assistance to himself, but that when dead he rose again, and showed the marks of his punishment, and how his hands were pierced with nails: who beheld this? A half-frantic[6] woman, as you state, and some other one, perhaps, of those who were engaged in the same system of delusion, who had either dreamed so, owing to a peculiar state of mind,[7] or under the influence of a wandering imagination had formed to himself an appearance according to his own wishes,[8] which has been the case with numberless individuals; or, which is most probable, one who desired to impress others with this portent, and by such a falsehood to furnish an occasion to impostors like himself."

[1] Cf. Herodot. iv. 95.
[2] Cf. Herodot. ii. 122.
[3] Cf. Diodor. iv. *Bibl. Hist.*
[4] Cf. Diodor. iv. *Bibl. Hist.*
[5] *αὐτῷ σώματι.*
[6] *γυνὴ πάροιστρος.*
[7] *κατά τινα διάθεσιν ὀνειρώξας.*
[8] *ἢ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν δοξῇ πεπλανημένῃ φαντασιωθείς.*

Now, since it is a Jew who makes these statements, we shall conduct the defence of our Jesus as if we were replying to a Jew, still continuing the comparison derived from the accounts regarding Moses, and saying to him: "How many others are there who practise similar juggling tricks to those of Moses, in order to deceive their silly hearers, and who make gain by their deception?" Now this objection would be more appropriate in the mouth of one who did not believe in Moses (as we might quote the instances of Zamolxis and Pythagoras, who were engaged in such juggling tricks) than in that of a Jew, who is not very learned in the histories of the Greeks. An Egyptian, moreover, who did not believe the miracles of Moses, might credibly adduce the instance of Rhampsinitus, saying that it was far more credible that he had descended to Hades, and had played at dice with Demeter, and that after stealing from her a golden napkin he exhibited it as a sign of his having been in Hades, and of his having returned thence, than that Moses should have recorded that he entered into the darkness, where God was, and that he alone, above all others, drew near to God. For the following is his statement: "Moses alone shall come near the Lord; but the rest shall not come nigh."[1] We, then, who are the disciples of Jesus, say to the Jew who urges these objections: "While assailing our belief in Jesus, defend yourself, and answer the Egyptian and the Greek objectors: what will you say to those charges which you brought against our Jesus, but which also might be brought against Moses first? And if you should make a vigorous effort to defend Moses, as indeed his history does admit of a clear and powerful defence, you will unconsciously, in your support of Moses, be an unwilling assistant in establishing the greater divinity of Jesus."

Chapter LVI.

But since the Jew says that these histories of the alleged descent of heroes to Hades, and of their return thence, are juggling impositions,[2] maintaining that these heroes disappeared for a certain time, and secretly withdrew themselves from

[1] Cf. Ex. xxiv. 2.

[2] τερατείας.

the sight of all men, and gave themselves out afterwards as having returned from Hades,—for such is the meaning which his words seem to convey respecting the Odrysian Orpheus, and the Thessalian Protesilaus, and the Tænarian Hercules, and Theseus also,—let us endeavour to show that the account of Jesus being raised from the dead cannot possibly be compared to these. For each one of the heroes respectively mentioned might, had he wished, have secretly withdrawn himself from the sight of men, and returned again, if so determined, to those whom he had left; but seeing that Jesus was crucified before all the Jews, and His body slain in the presence of His nation, how can they bring themselves to say that He practised a similar deception[1] with those heroes who are related to have gone down to Hades, and to have returned thence? But we say that the following consideration might be adduced, perhaps, as a defence of the public crucifixion of Jesus, especially in connection with the existence of those stories of heroes who are supposed to have been compelled[2] to descend to Hades: that if we were to suppose Jesus to have died an obscure death, so that the fact of His decease was not patent to the whole nation of the Jews, and afterwards to have actually risen from the dead, there would, in such a case, have been ground for the same suspicion entertained regarding the heroes being also entertained regarding Himself. Probably, then, in addition to other causes for the crucifixion of Jesus, this also may have contributed to His dying a conspicuous death upon the cross, that no one might have it in his power to say that He voluntarily withdrew from the sight of men, and seemed only to die, without really doing so; but, appearing again, made a juggler's trick[3] of the resurrection from the dead. But a clear and unmistakeable proof of the fact I hold to be the undertaking of His disciples, who devoted themselves to the teaching of a doctrine which was attended with danger to human life,—a doctrine which they would not have taught with such courage had they invented the resurrection of Jesus from the dead;

[1] πῶς οἴονται τὸ παραπλήσιον πλάσασθαι λέγειν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱστορουμένοις, etc.

[2] καταβεβηκέναι βιᾷ. Bohereau proposes the omission of βιᾷ.

[3] ἐτερατεύσατο.

and who also, at the same time, not only prepared others to despise death, but were themselves the first to manifest their disregard for its terrors.

Chapter LVII.

But observe whether this Jew of Celsus does not talk very blindly, in saying that it is impossible for any one to rise from the dead with a veritable body, his language being: "But this is the question, whether any one who was really dead ever rose again with a veritable body?" Now a Jew would not have uttered these words, who believed what is recorded in the third and fourth books of Kings regarding little children, of whom the one was raised up by Elijah,[1] and the other by Elisha.[2] And on this account, too, I think it was that Jesus appeared to no other nation than the Jews, who had become accustomed to miraculous occurrences; so that, by comparing what they themselves believed with the works which were done by Him, and with what was related of Him, they might confess that He, in regard to whom greater things were done, and by whom mightier marvels were performed, was greater than all those who preceded Him.

Chapter LVIII.

Further, after these Greek stories which the Jew adduced respecting those who were guilty of juggling practices,[3] and who pretended to have risen from the dead, he says to those Jews who are converts to Christianity: "Do you imagine the statements of others not only to be myths, but to have the appearance of such, while you have discovered a becoming and credible termination to your drama in the voice from the cross, when he breathed his last?" We reply to the Jew: "What you adduce as myths, we regard also as such; but the statements of the Scriptures which are common to us both, in which not you only, but we also, take pride, we do not at all regard as myths. And therefore we accord our belief to those who have therein related that some rose from the dead, as not being guilty of imposition; and to Him especially there mentioned

[1] Cf. 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22.
[2] Cf. 2 Kings iv. 34, 35.
[3] τερατευομένοις.

as having risen, who both predicted the event Himself, and was the subject of prediction by others. And His resurrection is more miraculous than that of the others in this respect, that they were raised by the prophets Elijah and Elisha, while He was raised by none of the prophets, but by His Father in heaven. And therefore His resurrection also produced greater results than theirs. For what great good has accrued to the world from the resurrection of the children through the instrumentality of Elijah and Elisha, such as has resulted from the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus, accepted as an article of belief, and as effected through the agency of divine power?"

Chapter lix.

He imagines also that both the earthquake and the darkness were an invention;[1] but regarding these, we have in the preceding pages made our defence, according to our ability, adducing the testimony of Phlegon, who relates that these events took place at the time when our Saviour suffered. And he goes on to say, that "Jesus, while alive, was of no assistance to himself, but that he arose after death, and exhibited the marks of his punishment, and showed how his hands had been pierced by nails." We ask him what he means by the expression, "was of no assistance to himself?" For if he means it to refer to want of virtue, we reply that He *was* of very great assistance. For He neither uttered nor committed anything that was improper, but was truly "led as a sheep to the slaughter, and was dumb as a lamb before the shearer;"[2] and the Gospel testifies that He opened not His mouth. But if Celsus applies the expression to things indifferent and corporeal,[3] [meaning that in such Jesus could render no help to Himself,] we say that we have proved from the Gospels that He went voluntarily to encounter His sufferings. Speaking next of the statements in the Gospels, that after His resurrection He showed the marks of His punishment, and how His hands had been pierced, he asks, "Who beheld this?" And discrediting the narrative of Mary Magdalene, who is related to have seen Him, he replies, "A half-

[1] τερατείαν.

[2] Isa. liii. 7.

[3] εἰ δὲ τὸ "ἐπήρκεσεν" ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων καὶ σωματικῶν λαμβάνει.

frantic woman, as ye state." And because she is not the only one who is recorded to have seen the Saviour after His resurrection, but others also are mentioned, this Jew of Celsus calumniates these statements also in adding, "And some one else of those engaged in the same system of deception!"

Chapter LX.

In the next place, as if this were possible, viz. that the image of a man who was dead could appear to another as if he were still living, he adopts this opinion as an Epicurean, and says, "That some one having so dreamed owing to a peculiar state of mind, or having, under the influence of a perverted imagination, formed such an appearance as he himself desired, reported that such had been seen; and this," he continues, "has been the case with numberless individuals." But even if this statement of his seems to have a considerable degree of force, it is nevertheless only fitted to confirm a necessary doctrine, that the soul of the dead exists in a separate state [from the body]; and he who adopts such an opinion does not believe without good reason in the immortality, or at least continued existence, of the soul, as even Plato says in his treatise on the Soul that shadowy phantoms of persons already dead have appeared to some around their sepulchres. Now the phantoms which exist about the soul of the dead are produced by some substance, and this substance is in the soul, which exists apart in a body said to be of splendid appearance.[1] But Celsus, unwilling to admit any such view, will have it that some dreamed a waking dream,[2] and, under the influence of a perverted imagination, formed to themselves such an image as they desired. Now it is not irrational to believe that a dream may take place while one is asleep; but to suppose a waking vision in the case of those who are not altogether out of their senses, and under the influence of delirium or hypochondria, is incredible. And Celsus, seeing this, called the woman "half-mad,"—a statement which is not made by the history recording the fact, but

[1] τὰ μὲν οὖν γινόμενα περὶ ψυχῆς τεθνηκότων φαντάσματα ἀπό τινος ὑποκειμένου γίνεται, τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ὑφεστηκυῖαν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ αὐγοειδεῖ σώματι ψυχήν. Cf. note in Benedictine ed.

[2] ὑπαρ.

from which he took occasion to charge the occurrences with being untrue.

Chapter LXI.

Jesus accordingly, as Celsus imagines, exhibited after His death only the appearance of wounds received on the cross, and was not in reality so wounded as He is described to have been; whereas, according to the teaching of the Gospel—some portions of which Celsus arbitrarily accepts, in order to find ground of accusation, and other parts of which he rejects—Jesus called to Him one of His disciples who was sceptical, and who deemed the miracle an impossibility. That individual had, indeed, expressed his belief in the statement of the woman who said that she had seen Him, because he did not think it impossible that the soul of a dead man could be seen; but he did not yet consider the report to be true that He had been raised in a body, which was the antitype of the former.[1] And therefore he did not merely say, "Unless I see, I will not believe;" but he added, "Unless I put my hand into the print of the nails, and lay my hands upon His side, I will not believe." These words were spoken by Thomas, who deemed it possible that the body of the soul might be seen by the eye of sense, resembling in all respects its former appearance,

> "Both in size, and in beauty of eyes,
> And in voice;"

and frequently, too,

> "Having, also, such garments around the person[3] [as when alive]."

Jesus accordingly, having called Thomas, said, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing."[4]

Chapter LXII.

Now it followed from all the predictions which were uttered regarding Him—amongst which was this prediction of the resurrection—and from all that was done by Him, and from

[1] ἐν σώματι ἀντιτύπῳ ἐγηγέρθαι.
[2] ψυχῆς σῶμα.
[3] Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, xxiii. 66, 67.
[4] Cf. John xx. 27.

all the events which befell Him, that this event should be marvellous above all others. For it had been said beforehand by the prophet in the person of Jesus: "My flesh shall rest in hope, and Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, and wilt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption."[1] And truly, after His resurrection, He existed in a body intermediate, as it were, between the grossness of that which He had before His sufferings, and the appearance of a soul uncovered by such a body. And hence it was, that when His disciples were together, and Thomas with them, there "came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger,"[2] etc. And in the Gospel of Luke also, while Simon and Cleopas were conversing with each other respecting all that had happened to them, Jesus "drew near, and went with them. And their eyes were holden, that they should not know Him. And He said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk?" And when their eyes were opened, and they knew Him, then the Scripture says, in express words, "And He vanished out of their sight."[3] And although Celsus may wish to place what is told of Jesus, and of those who saw Him after His resurrection, on the same level with imaginary appearances of a different kind, and those who have invented such, yet to those who institute a candid and intelligent examination, the events will appear only the more miraculous.

Chapter LXIII.

After these points, Celsus proceeds to bring against the Gospel narrative a charge which is not to be lightly passed over, saying that "if Jesus desired to show that his power was really divine, he ought to have appeared to those who had ill-treated him, and to him who had condemned him, and to all men universally." For it appears to us also to be true, according to the Gospel account, that He was not seen after His resurrection in the same manner as He used formerly to show Himself—publicly, and to all men. But it is recorded in the Acts, that "being seen during forty days," He expounded to His

[1] Ps. xvi. 9, 10. [2] John xx. 26, 27. [3] Luke xxiv. 15, 31.

disciples "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."[1] And in the Gospels[2] it is not stated that He was always with them; but that on one occasion He appeared in their midst, after eight days, when the doors were shut, and on another in some similar fashion. And Paul also, in the concluding portions of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, in reference to His not having publicly appeared as He did in the period before He suffered, writes as follows: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto the present time, but some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen of James, then of all the apostles. And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."[3] I am of opinion now that the statements in this passage contain some great and wonderful mysteries, which are beyond the grasp not merely of the great multitude of ordinary believers, but even of those who are far advanced [in Christian knowledge], and that in them the reason would be explained why He did not show Himself, after His resurrection from the dead, in the same manner as before that event. And in a treatise of this nature, composed in answer to a work directed against the Christians and their faith, observe whether we are able to adduce a few rational arguments out of a greater number, and thus make an impression upon the hearers of this apology.

Chapter LXIV.

Although Jesus was only a single individual, He was nevertheless more things than one, according to the different standpoint from which He might be regarded;[4] nor was He seen in the same way by all who beheld Him. Now, that He was more things than one, according to the varying point of view, is clear from this statement, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life;" and from this, "I am the bread;" and this, "I am the door," and innumerable others. And that when seen He did

[1] Acts i. 3.
[2] Cf. John xx. 26.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 3–8.
[4] πλείονα τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ ἦν.

not appear in like fashion to all those who saw Him, but according to their several ability to receive Him, will be clear to those who notice why, at the time when He was about to be transfigured on the high mountain, He did not admit all His apostles [to this sight], but only Peter, and James, and John, because they alone were capable of beholding His glory on that occasion, and of observing the glorified appearance of Moses and Elijah, and of listening to their conversation, and to the voice from the heavenly cloud. I am of opinion, too, that before He ascended the mountain where His disciples came to Him alone, and where He taught them the beatitudes, when He was somewhere in the lower part of the mountain, and when, as it became late, He healed those who were brought to Him, freeing them from all sickness and disease, He did not appear the same person to the sick, and to those who needed His healing aid, as to those who were able by reason of their strength to go up the mountain along with Him. Nay, even when He interpreted privately to His own disciples the parables which were delivered to the multitudes without, from whom the explanation was withheld, as they who heard them explained were endowed with higher organs of hearing than they who heard them without explanation, so was it altogether the same with the eyes of their soul, and, I think, also with those of their body.[1] And the following statement shows that He had not always the same appearance, viz. that Judas, when about to betray Him, said to the multitudes who were setting out with him, as not being acquainted with Him, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, the same is he."[2] And I think that the Saviour Himself indicates the same thing by the words: "I was daily with you, teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me."[3] Entertaining, then, such exalted views regarding Jesus, not only with respect to the Deity within, and which was hidden from the view of the multitude, but with respect to the transfiguration of His body, which took place when and to whom He would, we say, that before Jesus had "put off the governments and powers,"[4] and

[1] οὕτω καὶ ταῖς ὄψεσι πάντως μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἐγὼ δ' ἡγοῦμαι, ὅτι καὶ τοῦ σώματος.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 48.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 55.

[4] τὸν μὴ ἀπεκδυσάμενον, etc. Cf. Alford, *in loco* (Col. ii. 15).

while as yet He was not dead unto sin, all men were capable of seeing Him; but that, when He had "put off the governments and powers," and had no longer anything which was capable of being seen by the multitude, all who had formerly seen Him were not now able to behold Him. And therefore, sparing them, He did not show Himself to all after His resurrection from the dead.

Chapter LXV.

And why do I say "to all?" For even with His own apostles and disciples He was not perpetually present, nor did He constantly show Himself to them, because they were not able without intermission[1] to receive His divinity. For His deity was more resplendent after He had finished the economy[2] [of salvation]: and this Peter, surnamed Cephas, the first-fruits as it were of the apostles, was enabled to behold, and along with him the twelve (Matthias having been substituted in room of Judas); and after them He appeared to the five hundred brethren at once, and then to James, and subsequently to all the others besides the twelve apostles, perhaps to the seventy also, and lastly to Paul, as to one born out of due time, and who knew well how to say, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given;" and probably the expression "least of all" has the same meaning with "one born out of due time." For as no one could reasonably blame Jesus for not having admitted all His apostles to the high mountain, but only the three already mentioned, on the occasion of His transfiguration, when He was about to manifest the splendour which appeared in His garments, and the glory of Moses and Elias talking with Him, so none could reasonably object to the statements of the apostles, who introduce the appearance of Jesus after His resurrection as having been made not to all, but to those only whom He knew to have received eyes capable of seeing His resurrection. I think, moreover, that the following statement regarding Him has an apologetic value[3] in reference to our subject, viz.: "For to this end Christ died, and rose again, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living."[4]

[1] διηνεκῶς. [2] τὴν οἰκονομίαν τελέσαντος.

[3] χρήσιμον δ' οἶμαι πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τῶν προκειμένων. [4] Cf. Rom. xiv. 9.

For observe, it is conveyed in these words, that Jesus died that He might be Lord of the dead; and that He rose again to be Lord not only of the dead, but also of the living. And the apostle understands, undoubtedly, by the dead over whom Christ is to be Lord, those who are so called in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible;"[1] and by the living, those who are to be changed, and who are different from the dead who are to be raised. And respecting the living the words are these, "And we shall be changed;" an expression which follows immediately after the statement, "The dead shall be raised first."[2] Moreover, in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, describing the same change in different words, he says that they who sleep are not the same as those who are alive; his language being, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them that are asleep."[3] The explanation which appeared to us to be appropriate to this passage, we gave in the exegetical remarks which we have made on the first Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Chapter LXVI.

And be not surprised if all the multitudes who have believed on Jesus do not behold His resurrection, when Paul, writing to the Corinthians, can say to them, as being incapable of receiving greater matters, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified;"[4] which is the same as saying, "Hitherto ye were not able, neither yet now are ye able, for ye are still carnal."[5] The Scripture, therefore, doing everything by appointment of God, has recorded of Jesus, that before His sufferings He appeared to all indifferently, but not always; while after His sufferings He no longer appeared to all in the same way, but with a certain

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 52. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 52 with 1 Thess. iv. 16.
[3] Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 13–15. [4] 1 Cor. ii. 2. [5] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 2, 3.

discrimination which measured out to each his due. And as it is related that "God appeared to Abraham," or to one of the saints, and this "appearance" was not a thing of constant occurrence, but took place at intervals, and not to all, so understand that the Son of God appeared in the one case on the same principle that God appeared to the latter.[1]

Chapter LXVII.

To the best of our ability, therefore, as in a treatise of this nature, we have answered the objection, that "if Jesus had really wished to manifest his divine power, he ought to have shown himself to those who ill-treated him, and to the judge who condemned him, and to all without reservation." There was, however, no obligation on Him to appear either to the judge who condemned Him, or to those who ill-treated Him. For Jesus spared both the one and the other, that they might not be smitten with blindness, as the men of Sodom were when they conspired against the beauty of the angels entertained by Lot. And here is the account of the matter: "But the men put forth their hand, and pulled Lot into the house to them, and shut to the door. And they smote the men who were at the door of the house with blindness, both small and great; so that they wearied themselves to find the door."[2] Jesus, accordingly, wished to show that His power was divine to each one who was capable of seeing it, and according to the measure of His capability. And I do not suppose that He guarded against being seen on any other ground than from a regard to the fitness of those who were incapable of seeing Him. And it is in vain for Celsus to add, "For he had no longer occasion to fear any man after his death, being, as you say, a God; nor was he sent into the world at all for the purpose of being hid." Yet He was sent into the world not only to become known, but also to be hid. For all that He was, was not known even to those to whom He was known, but a certain part of Him remained concealed even from them; and to some He was not known at all. And He opened the gates of light to those who

[1] οὕτω μοι νόει καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὦφθαι τῇ παραπλησίᾳ εἰς τὸ περὶ ἐκείνων, εἰς τὸ ὦφθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Θεόν, κρίσει.

[2] Cf. Gen. xix. 10, 11.

were the sons of darkness and of night, and had devoted themselves to becoming the sons of light and of the day. For our Saviour Lord, like a good physician, came rather to us who were full of sins, than to those who were righteous.

Chapter LXVIII.

But let us observe how this Jew of Celsus asserts that, "if this at least would have helped to manifest his divinity, he ought accordingly to have at once disappeared from the cross." Now this seems to me to be like the argument of those who oppose the doctrine of providence, and who arrange things differently from what they are, and allege that the world would be better if it were as they arrange it. Now, in those instances in which their arrangement is a possible one, they are proved to make the world, so far as depends upon them, worse by their arrangement than it actually is; while in those cases in which they do not portray things worse than they really are, they are shown to desire impossibilities; so that in either case they are deserving of ridicule. And here, accordingly, that there was no impossibility in His coming, as a being of diviner nature, in order to disappear when He chose, is clear from the very nature of the case; and is certain, moreover, from what is recorded of Him, in the judgment of those who do not adopt certain portions merely of the narrative that they may have ground for accusing Christianity, and who consider other portions to be fiction. For it is related in St. Luke's Gospel, that Jesus after His resurrection took bread, and blessed it, and breaking it, distributed it to Simon and Cleopas; and when they had received the bread, "their eyes were opened, and they knew Him, and He vanished out of their sight."[1]

Chapter LXIX.

But we wish to show that His instantaneous bodily disappearance from the cross was not better fitted to serve the purposes of the whole economy of salvation [than His remaining upon it was]. For the mere letter and narrative of the events which happened to Jesus do not present the whole view of the truth. For each one of them can be shown, to those who have an in-

[1] Cf. Luke xxiv. 30, 31.

telligent apprehension of Scripture, to be a symbol of something else. Accordingly, as His crucifixion contains a truth, represented in the words, "I am crucified with Christ," and intimated also in these, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me, and I unto the world;"[1] and as His death was necessary, because of the statement, "For in that He died, He died unto sin once,"[2] and this, "Being made conformable to His death,"[3] and this, "For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him:"[4] so also His burial has an application to those who have been made conformable to His death, who have been both crucified with Him, and have died with Him; as is declared by Paul, "For we were buried with Him by baptism, and have also risen with Him."[5] These matters, however, which relate to His burial, and his sepulchre, and him who buried Him, we shall expound at greater length on a more suitable occasion, when it will be our professed purpose to treat of such things. But, for the present, it is sufficient to notice the clean linen in which the pure body of Jesus was to be enwrapped, and the new tomb which Joseph had hewn out of the rock, where "no one was yet lying,"[6] or, as John expresses it, "wherein was never man yet laid."[7] And observe whether the harmony of the three evangelists here is not fitted to make an impression: for they have thought it right to describe the tomb as one that was "quarried or hewn out of the rock;" so that he who examines the words of the narrative may see something worthy of consideration, both in them and in the *newness* of the tomb,—a point mentioned by Matthew and John,[8]—and in the statement of Luke and John,[9] that no one had ever been interred therein before. For it became Him, who was unlike other dead men (but who even in death manifested signs of life in the water and the blood), and who was, so to speak, a *new* dead man, to be laid in a new and clean

[1] Cf. Gal. vi. 14. [2] Rom. vi. 10. [3] Phil. iii. 10.
[4] 2 Tim. ii. 11. [5] Cf. Rom. vi. 4.
[6] Luke xxiii. 53, *οὐκ ἦν οὔπω οὐδεὶς κείμενος.*
[7] John xix. 41, *ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη.*
[8] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 60 with John xix. 41.
[9] Cf. Luke xxiii. 53 with John xix. 41.

tomb, in order that, as His birth was purer than any other (in consequence of His being born, not in the way of ordinary generation, but of a virgin), His burial also might have the purity symbolically indicated in His body being deposited in a sepulchre which was new, not built of stones gathered from various quarters, and having no natural unity, but quarried and hewed out of *one* rock, united together in all its parts. Regarding the explanation, however, of these points, and the method of ascending from the narratives themselves to the things which they symbolized, one might treat more profoundly, and in a manner more adapted to their divine character, on a more suitable occasion, in a work expressly devoted to such subjects. The literal narrative, however, one might thus explain, viz. that it was appropriate for Him who had resolved to endure suspension upon the cross, to maintain all the accompaniments of the character He had assumed, in order that He who as a man had been put to death, and who as a man had died, might also as a man be buried. But even if it had been related in the Gospels, according to the view of Celsus, that Jesus had immediately disappeared from the cross, he and other unbelievers would have found fault with the narrative, and would have brought against it some such objection as this: "Why, pray, did he disappear after he had been put upon the cross, and not disappear before he suffered?" If, then, after learning from the Gospels that He did not at once disappear from the cross, they imagine that they can find fault with the narrative, because it did not invent, as they consider it ought to have done, any such instantaneous disappearance, but gave a true account of the matter, is it not reasonable that they should accord their faith also to His resurrection, and should believe that He, according to His pleasure, on one occasion, when the doors were shut, stood in the midst of His disciples, and on another, after distributing bread to two of His acquaintances, immediately disappeared from view, after He had spoken to them certain words?

Chapter LXX.

But how is it that this Jew of Celsus could say that Jesus concealed Himself? For his words regarding Him are these:

"And who that is sent as a messenger ever conceals himself when he ought to make known his message?" Now, He did not conceal Himself, who said to those who sought to apprehend Him, "I was daily teaching openly in the temple, and ye laid no hold upon me." But having once already answered this charge of Celsus, now again repeated, we shall content ourselves with what we have formerly said. We have answered, also, in the preceding pages, this objection, that "while he was in the body, and no one believed upon him, he preached to all without intermission; but when he might have produced a powerful belief in himself after rising from the dead, he showed himself secretly only to one woman, and to his own boon companions."[1] Now it is not true that He showed Himself only to one woman; for it is stated in the Gospel according to Matthew, that "in the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre. And, behold, there had been a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord had descended from heaven, and come and rolled back the stone."[2] And, shortly after, Matthew adds: "And, behold, Jesus met *them*"—clearly meaning the afore-mentioned Marys—"saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him."[3] And we answered, too, the charge, that "while undergoing his punishment he was seen by all, but after his resurrection only by one," when we offered our defence of the fact that "He was not seen by all." And now we might say that His merely human attributes were visible to all men, but those which were divine in their nature—I speak of the attributes not as related, but as distinct[4]—were not capable of being received by all. But observe here the manifest contradiction into which Celsus falls. For having said, a little before, that Jesus had appeared secretly to one woman and His own boon companions, he immediately subjoins: "While undergoing his punishment he was seen by all men, but after his resurrection by one, whereas the opposite ought to have happened." And let us hear what he means by "ought to have happened." The being seen by

[1] τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ θιασώταις. [2] Matt. xxviii. 1, 2. [3] Matt. xxviii. 9.
[4] λέγω δὲ οὐ περὶ τῶν σχέσιν πρὸς ἕτερα ἐχόντων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν κατὰ διαφοράν.

all men while undergoing His punishment, but after His resurrection only by one individual, are opposites.[1] Now, so far as his language conveys a meaning, he would have that to take place which is both impossible and absurd, viz., that while undergoing His punishment He should be seen only by one individual, but after His resurrection by all men! or else how will you explain his words, "The opposite ought to have happened?"

Chapter lxxi.

Jesus taught us who it was that sent Him, in the words, "None knoweth the Father but the Son;"[2] and in these, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."[3] He, treating of Deity, stated to His true disciples the doctrine regarding God; and we, discovering traces of such teaching in the Scripture narratives, take occasion from such to aid our theological conceptions,[4] hearing it declared in one passage, that "God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all;"[5] and in another, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."[6] But the purposes for which the Father sent Him are innumerable; and these any one may ascertain who chooses, partly from the prophets who prophesied of Him, and partly from the narratives of the evangelists. And not a few things also will he learn from the apostles, and especially from Paul. Moreover, those who are pious He leadeth to the light, and those who sin He will punish,—a circumstance which Celsus not observing, has represented Him "as one who will lead the pious to the light, and who will have mercy on others, whether they sin or repent."[7]

[1] ἐναντίον τὸ μὲν κολαζόμενον πᾶσιν ἑωρᾶσθαι, ἀναστάντα δὲ πᾶσιν. The Benedictine editor reads τὸν μὲν κολαζόμενον, and Bohereau proposes ἐναντίον τῷ κολαζόμενον μέν, etc.

[2] Cf. Luke x. 22. [3] John i. 18.

[4] ὧν ἴχνη ἐν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις εὑρίσκοντες ἀφορμὰς ἔχομεν θεολογεῖν.

[5] 1 John i. 5. [6] John iv. 24.

[7] The text is, τοὺς δὲ ἁμαρτάνοντας ἢ μεταγνόντας ἐλεήσων. Bohereau would read μὴ μεταγνόντας, or would render the passage as if the reading were ἢ ἁμαρτανόντας, ἢ μεταγνόντας. This suggestion has been adopted in the translation.

Chapter LXXII.

After the above statements, he continues: "If he wished to remain hid, why was there heard a voice from heaven proclaiming him to be the Son of God? And if he did not seek to remain concealed, why was he punished? or why did he die?" Now, by such questions he thinks to convict the histories of discrepancy, not observing that Jesus neither desired all things regarding Himself to be known to all whom He happened to meet, nor yet all things to be unknown. Accordingly, the voice from heaven which proclaimed Him to be the Son of God, in the words, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,"[1] is not stated to have been audible to the multitudes, as this Jew of Celsus supposed. The voice from the cloud on the high mountain, moreover, was heard only by those who had gone up with Him. For the divine voice is of such a nature, as to be heard only by those whom the speaker wishes to hear it. And I maintain, that the voice of God which is referred to, is neither air which has been struck, nor any concussion of the air, nor anything else which is mentioned in treatises on the voice;[2] and therefore it is heard by a better and more divine organ of hearing than that of sense. And when the speaker will not have his voice to be heard by all, he that has the finer ear hears the voice of God, while he who has the ears of his soul deadened does not perceive that it is God who speaks. These things I have mentioned because of his asking, "Why was there heard a voice from heaven proclaiming him to be the Son of God?" while with respect to the query, "Why was he punished, if he wished to remain hid?" what has been stated at greater length in the preceding pages on the subject of His sufferings may suffice.

Chapter LXXIII.

The Jew proceeds, after this, to state as a consequence what does not follow from the premises; for it does *not* follow from "His having wished, by the punishments which He underwent, to teach us also to despise death," that after His resurrection

[1] Matt. iii. 17.

[2] οὐδέπω δὲ λέγω, ὅτι οὐ πάντως ἐστὶν ἀὴρ πεπληγμένος, ἢ πληγὴ ἀέρος, ἢ ὅτι ποτὲ λέγεται ἐν τοῖς περὶ φωνης.

He should openly summon all men to the light, and instruct them in the object of His coming. For He had formerly summoned all men to the light in the words, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."[1] And the object of His coming had been explained at great length in His discourses on the beatitudes, and in the announcements which followed them, and in the parables, and in His conversations with the scribes and Pharisees. And the instruction afforded us by the Gospel of John, shows that the eloquence of Jesus consisted not in words, but in deeds; while it is manifest from the Gospel narratives that His speech was "with power," on which account also they marvelled at Him.

Chapter LXXIV.

In addition to all this, the Jew further says: "All these statements are taken from your own books, in addition to which we need no other witness; for ye fall upon your own swords."[2]

Now we have proved that many foolish assertions, opposed to the narratives of our Gospels, occur in the statements of the Jew, either with respect to Jesus or ourselves. And I do not think that he has shown that "we fall upon our own swords;" but he only so imagines. And when the Jew adds, in a general way, this to his former remarks: "O most high and heavenly one! what God, on appearing to men, is received with incredulity?" we must say to him, that according to the accounts in the law of Moses, God is related to have visited the Hebrews in a most public manner, not only in the signs and wonders performed in Egypt, and also in the passage of the Red Sea, and in the pillar of fire and cloud of light, but also when the Decalogue was announced to the whole people, and yet was received with incredulity by those who saw these things: for had they believed what they saw and heard, they would not have fashioned the calf, nor changed their own glory into the likeness of a grass-eating calf; nor would they have said to one another with reference to the calf, "These be thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."[3] And observe whether it is not entirely in keeping with the

[1] Cf. Matt. xi. 28.

[2] αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς περιπίπτετε.

[3] Cf. Ex. xxxii. 4.

character of the same people, who formerly refused to believe such wonders and such appearances of divinity, throughout the whole period of wandering in the wilderness, as they are recorded in the law of the Jews to have done, to refuse to be convinced also, on occasion of the glorious advent of Jesus, by the mighty words which were spoken by Him with authority, and the marvels which He performed in the presence of all the people.

Chapter LXXV.

I think what has been stated is enough to convince any one that the unbelief of the Jews with regard to Jesus was in keeping with what is related of this people from the beginning. For I would say in reply to this Jew of Celsus, when he asks, "What God that appeared among men is received with incredulity, and that, too, when appearing to those who expect him? or why, pray, is he not recognised by those who have been long looking for him?" what answer, friends, would you have us return to your[1] questions? Which class of miracles, in your judgment, do you regard as the greater? Those which were wrought in Egypt and the wilderness, or those which we declare that Jesus performed among you? For if the former are in your opinion greater than the latter, does it not appear from this very fact to be in conformity with the character of those who disbelieved the greater to despise the less? And this is the opinion entertained with respect to our accounts of the miracles of Jesus. But if those related of Jesus are considered to be as great as those recorded of Moses, what strange thing has come to pass among a nation which has manifested incredulity with regard to the commencement of both dispensations?[2] For the beginning of the legislation was in the time of Moses, in whose work are recorded the sins of the unbelievers and wicked among you, while the commencement of our legislation and second covenant is admitted to have been in the time of Jesus. And by your unbelief of Jesus ye show that ye are the sons of those who in the desert discredited the

[1] The text reads ἡμῶν, for which Bohereau and the Benedictine editor propose either ὑμᾶς or ἡμᾶς, the former of which is preferred by Lommatzsch.

[2] κατ' ἀμφοτέρας τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπιστοῦντι.

divine appearances; and thus what was spoken by our Saviour will be applicable also to you who believed not on Him: "Therefore ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers."[1] And there is fulfilled among you also the prophecy which said: "Your life shall hang in doubt before your eyes, and you will have no assurance of your life."[2] For ye did not believe in the life which came to visit the human race.

Chapter LXXVI.

Celsus, in adopting the character of a Jew, could not discover any objections to be urged against the gospel which might not be retorted on him as liable to be brought also against the law and the prophets. For he censures Jesus in such words as the following: "He makes use of threats, and reviles men on light grounds, when he says, 'Woe unto you,' and 'I tell you beforehand.' For by such expressions he manifestly acknowledges his inability to persuade; and this would not be the case with a God, or even a prudent man." Observe, now, whether these charges do not manifestly recoil upon the Jew. For in the writings of the law and the prophets God makes use of threats and revilings, when He employs language of not less severity than that found in the Gospel, such as the following expressions of Isaiah: "Woe unto them that join house to house, and lay field to field;"[3] and, "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink;"[4] and, "Woe unto them that draw their sins after them as with a long rope;"[5] and, "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil;"[6] and, "Woe unto those of you who are mighty to drink wine;"[7] and innumerable other passages of the same kind. And does not the following resemble the threats of which he speaks: "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters?"[8] and so on, to which he subjoins such threats as are equal in severity to those which, he says, Jesus made use of. For is it not a threatening, and a great one, which declares, "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land,

[1] Cf. Luke xi. 48.
[2] Cf. Deut. xxviii. 66.
[3] Isa. v. 8.
[4] Isa. v. 11.
[5] Isa. v. 18.
[6] Isa. v. 20.
[7] Isa. v. 22.
[8] Cf. Isa. i. 4.

strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers?"[1] And are there not revilings in Ezekiel directed against the people, when the Lord says to the prophet, "Thou dwellest in the midst of scorpions?"[2] Were you serious, then, Celsus, in representing the Jew as saying of Jesus, that "he makes use of threats and revilings on slight grounds, when he employs the expressions, 'Woe unto you,' and 'I tell you beforehand?'" Do you not see that the charges which this Jew of yours brings against Jesus might be brought by him against God? For the God who speaks in the prophetic writings is manifestly liable to the same accusations, as Celsus regards them, of inability to persuade. I might, moreover, say to this Jew, who thinks that he makes a good charge against Jesus by such statements, that if he undertakes, in support of the scriptural account, to defend the numerous curses recorded in the books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, we should make as good, or better, a defence of the revilings and threatenings which are regarded as having been spoken by Jesus. And as respects the law of Moses itself, we are in a position to make a better defence of it than the Jew is, because we have been taught by Jesus to have a more intelligent apprehension of the writings of the law. Nay, if the Jew perceive the meaning of the prophetic Scriptures, he will be able to show that it is for no light reason that God employs threatenings and revilings, when He says, "Woe unto you," and "I tell you beforehand." And how should God employ such expressions for the conversion of men, which Celsus thinks that even a prudent man would not have recourse to? But Christians, who know only one God —the same who spoke in the prophets and in the Lord [Jesus] —can prove the reasonableness of those threatenings and revilings, as Celsus considers and entitles them. And here a few remarks shall be addressed to this Celsus, who professes both to be a philosopher, and to be acquainted with all our system. How is it, friend, when Hermes, in Homer, says to Odysseus,

> "Why, now, wretched man, do you come wandering alone
> over the mountain-tops?"[3]

that you are satisfied with the answer, which explains that the

[1] Isa. i. 7. [2] Ezek. ii. 6. [3] Cf. *Odyss.* x. 281.

Homeric Hermes addresses such language to Odysseus to remind him of his duty,[1] because it is characteristic of the Sirens to flatter and to say pleasing things, around whom

"Is a huge heap of bones,"[2]

and who say,

"Come hither, much lauded Odysseus, great glory of the Greeks;"[3]

whereas, if our prophets and Jesus Himself, in order to turn their hearers from evil, make use of such expressions as "Woe unto you," and what you regard as revilings, there is no condescension in such language to the circumstances of the hearers, nor any application of such words to them as healing[4] medicine? Unless, indeed, you would have God, or one who partakes of the divine nature, when conversing with men, to have regard to His own nature alone, and to what is worthy of Himself, but to have no regard to what is fitting to be brought before men who are under the dispensation and leading of His word, and with each one of whom He is to converse agreeably to his individual character. And is it not a ridiculous assertion regarding Jesus, to say that He was unable to persuade men, when you compare the state of matters not only among the Jews, who have many such instances recorded in the prophecies, but also among the Greeks, among whom all of those who have attained great reputation for their wisdom have been unable to persuade those who conspired against them, or to induce their judges or accusers to cease from evil, and to endeavour to attain to virtue by the way of philosophy?

Chapter LXXVII.

After this the Jew remarks, manifestly in accordance with the Jewish belief: "We certainly hope that there will be a bodily resurrection, and that we shall enjoy an eternal life; and the example and archetype of this will be He who is sent to us, and who will show that nothing is impossible with God." We do not know, indeed, whether the Jew would say of the expected Christ, that He exhibits in Himself an example of the resurrection; but let it be supposed that he both thinks

[1] ὑπὲρ ἐπιστροφῆς.
[2] Cf. *Odyss.* xii. 45.
[3] *Ibid.* xii. 184.
[4] παιώνιον φαρμάκον.

and says so. We shall give this answer, then, to him who has told us that he drew his information from our own writings: "Did you read those writings, friend, in which you think you discover matter of accusation against us, and not find there the resurrection of Jesus, and the declaration that He was the first-born from the dead? Or because you will not allow such things to have been recorded, were they not actually recorded?" But as the Jew still admits the resurrection of the body, I do not consider the present a suitable time to discuss the subject with one who both believes and says that there is a bodily resurrection, whether he has an articulate[1] understanding of such a topic, and is able to plead well on its behalf,[2] or not, but has only given his assent to it as being of a legendary character.[3] Let the above, then, be our reply to this Jew of Celsus. And when he adds, "Where, then, is he, that we may see him and believe upon him?" we answer: Where is He now who spoke in the prophecies, and who wrought miracles, that we may see and believe that He is part of God? Are *you* to be allowed to meet the objection, that God does not perpetually show Himself to the Hebrew nation, while *we* are not to be permitted the same defence with regard to Jesus, who has both once risen Himself, and led His disciples to believe in His resurrection, and so thoroughly persuaded them of its truth, that they show to all men by their sufferings how they are able to laugh at all the troubles of life, beholding the life eternal and the resurrection clearly demonstrated to them both in word and deed?

Chapter LXXVIII.

The Jew continues: "Did Jesus come into the world for this purpose, that we should not believe him?" To which we immediately answer, that He did not come with the object of producing incredulity among the Jews; but knowing beforehand that such would be the result, He foretold it, and made use of their unbelief for the calling of the Gentiles. For through their sin salvation came to the Gentiles, respecting whom the Christ who speaks in the prophecies says, "A people

[1] εἴτε διαρθροῦντα τὸ τοιοῦτον παρ' ἑαυτῷ.
[2] καὶ δυνάμενον πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ τοῦ λόγου καλῶς.
[3] ἀττὰ μυθικώτερον συγκατατιθέμενον τῷ λόγῳ.

whom I did not know became subject to me: they were obedient to the hearing of my ear;"[1] and, "I was found of them who sought me not; I became manifest to those who inquired not after me."[2] It is certain, moreover, that the Jews were punished even in this present life, after treating Jesus in the manner in which they did. And let the Jews assert what they will when we charge them with guilt, and say, "Is not the providence and goodness of God most wonderfully displayed in your punishment, and in your being deprived of Jerusalem, and of the sanctuary, and of your splendid worship?" For whatever they may say in reply with respect to the providence of God, we shall be able more effectually to answer it by remarking, that the providence of God was wonderfully manifested in using the transgression of that people for the purpose of calling into the kingdom of God, through Jesus Christ, those from among the Gentiles who were strangers to the covenant and aliens to the promises. And these things were foretold by the prophets, who said that, on account of the transgressions of the Hebrew nation, God would make choice, not of a nation, but of individuals chosen from all lands;[3] and, having selected the foolish things of the world, would cause an ignorant nation to become acquainted with the divine teaching, the kingdom of God being taken from the one and given to the other. And out of a larger number it is sufficient on the present occasion to adduce the prediction from the song in Deuteronomy regarding the calling of the Gentiles, which is as follows, being spoken in the person of the Lord: "They have moved me to jealousy with those who are not gods; they have provoked me to anger with their idols: and I will move them to jealousy with those who are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation."[4]

Chapter LXXIX.

The conclusion of all these arguments regarding Jesus is thus stated by the Jew: "He was therefore a man, and of such a nature, as the truth itself proves, and reason demonstrates him to be." I do not know, however, whether a man who had the courage to spread throughout the entire world his doctrine of

[1] Cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 44, 45.
[2] Cf. Isa. lxv. 1.
[3] οὐχὶ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ λογάδας πανταχόθεν.
[4] Cf. Deut. xxxii. 21.

religious worship and teaching,[1] could accomplish what he wished without the divine assistance, and could rise superior to all who withstood the progress of his doctrine—kings and rulers, and the Roman senate, and governors in all places, and the common people. And how could the nature of a man possessed of no inherent excellence convert so vast a multitude? For it would not be wonderful if it were only the wise who were so converted; but it is the most irrational of men, and those devoted to their passions, and who, by reason of their irrationality, change with the greater difficulty so as to adopt a more temperate course of life. And yet it is because Christ was the power of God and the wisdom of the Father that He accomplished, and still accomplishes, such results, although neither the Jews nor Greeks who disbelieve His word will so admit. And therefore we shall not cease to believe in God, according to the precepts of Jesus Christ, and to seek to convert those who are blind on the subject of religion, although it is they who are truly blind themselves that charge us with blindness: and they, whether Jews or Greeks, who lead astray those that follow them, accuse us of seducing men—a good seduction, truly!—that they may become temperate instead of dissolute, or at least may make advances to temperance; may become just instead of unjust, or at least may tend to become so; prudent instead of foolish, or be on the way to become such; and instead of cowardice, meanness, and timidity, may exhibit the virtues of fortitude and courage, especially displayed in the struggles undergone for the sake of their religion towards God, the Creator of all things. Jesus Christ therefore came announced beforehand, not by one prophet, but by all; and it was a proof of the ignorance of Celsus, to represent a Jew as saying that one prophet only had predicted the advent of Christ. But as this Jew of Celsus, after being thus introduced, asserting that these things were indeed in conformity with his own law, has somewhere here ended his discourse, with a mention of other matters not worthy of remembrance, I too shall here terminate this second book of my answer to his treatise. But if God permit, and the power of Christ abide in my soul, I shall endeavour in the third book to deal with the subsequent statements of Celsus.

[1] τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν θεοσέβειαν καὶ διδασκαλίαν.

BOOK III.

Chapter I.

IN the first book of our answer to the work of Celsus, who had boastfully entitled the treatise which he had composed against us *A True Discourse*, we have gone through, as you enjoined, my faithful Ambrosius, to the best of our ability, his preface, and the parts immediately following it, testing each one of his assertions as we went along, until we finished with the tirade[1] of this Jew of his, feigned to have been delivered against Jesus. And in the second book we met, as we best could, all the charges contained in the invective[1] of the said Jew, which were levelled at us who are believers in God through Christ; and now we enter upon this third division of our discourse, in which our object is to refute the allegations which he makes in his own person.

He gives it as his opinion, that "the controversy between Jews and Christians is a most foolish one," and asserts that "the discussions which we have with each other regarding Christ differ in no respect from what is called in the proverb 'a fight about the shadow of an ass;'"[2] and thinks that "there is nothing of importance[3] in the investigations of the Jews and Christians: for both believe that it was predicted by the Divine Spirit that one was to come as a Saviour to the human race, but do not yet agree on the point whether the person predicted has actually come or not." For we Christians, indeed, have believed in Jesus, as He who came according to the predictions of the prophets. But the majority of the Jews

[1] δημηγορία; cf. book i. c. 71.

[2] κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν καλουμένης ὄνου σκιᾶς μάχης. On this proverb, see Zenobius, *Centuria Sexta*, adag. 28, and the note of Schottius. Cf. also Suidas, *s.v.* ὄνου σκία.—De la Rue.

[3] σεμνὸν.

are so far from believing in Him, that those of them who lived at the time of His coming conspired against Him; and those of the present day, approving of what the Jews of former times dared to do against Him, speak evil of Him, asserting that it was by means of sorcery[1] that he passed himself off for Him who was predicted by the prophets as the One who was to come, and who was called, agreeably to the traditions of the Jews,[2] the Christ.

Chapter II.

But let Celsus, and those who assent to his charges, tell us whether it is at all like "an ass's shadow," that the Jewish prophets should have predicted the birth-place of Him who was to be the ruler of those who had lived righteous lives, and who are called the "heritage" of God;[3] and that Emmanuel should be conceived by a virgin; and that such signs and wonders should be performed by Him who was the subject of prophecy; and that His word should have such speedy course, that the voice of His apostles should go forth into all the earth; and that He should undergo certain sufferings after His condemnation by the Jews; and that He should rise again from the dead. For was it by chance[4] that the prophets made these announcements, with no persuasion of their truth in their minds,[5] moving them not only to speak, but to deem their announcements worthy of being committed to writing? And did so great a nation as that of the Jews, who had long ago received a country of their own wherein to dwell, recognise certain men as prophets, and reject others as utterers of false predictions, without any conviction of the soundness of the distinction?[5] And was there no motive which induced them to class with the books of Moses, which were held as sacred, the words of those persons who were afterwards deemed to be prophets? And can those who charge the Jews and Christians with folly, show us how the Jewish nation could have continued to subsist, had there existed among them no promise of the knowledge of future events? and how, while each of the surrounding nations believed,

[1] διά τινος γοητείας.
[2] κατὰ τὰ Ἰουδαίων πάτρια.
[3] τῶν χρηματιζόντων μερίδος Θεοῦ.
[4] ἆρα γὰρ ὡς ἔτυχε.
[5] σὺν οὐδεμιᾷ πιθανότητι.

agreeably to their ancient institutions, that they received oracles and predictions from those whom they accounted gods, this people alone, who were taught to view with contempt all those who were considered gods by the heathen, as not being gods, but demons, according to the declaration of the prophets, "For all the gods of the nations are demons,"[1] had among them no one who professed to be a prophet, and who could restrain such as, from a desire to know the future, were ready to desert[2] to the demons[1] of other nations? Judge, then, whether it were not a necessity, that as the whole nation had been taught to despise the deities of other lands, they should have had an abundance of prophets, who made known events which were of far greater importance in themselves,[3] and which surpassed the oracles of all other countries.

Chapter III.

In the next place, miracles were performed in all countries, or at least in many of them, as Celsus himself admits, instancing the case of Esculapius, who conferred benefits on many, and who foretold future events to entire cities, which were dedicated to him, such as Tricca, and Epidaurus, and Cos, and Pergamus; and along with Esculapius he mentions Aristeas of Proconnesus, and a certain Clazomenian, and Cleomedes of Astypalæa. But among the Jews alone, who say they are dedicated to the God of all things, there was wrought no miracle or sign which might help to confirm their faith in the Creator of all things, and strengthen their hope of another and better life! But how can they imagine such a state of things? For they would immediately have gone over to the worship of those demons which gave oracles and performed cures, and deserted the God who was believed, as far as words went,[4] to assist them, but who never manifested to them His

[1] Ps. xcvi. 5, δαιμόνια; "idols," Auth. Vers. We have in this passage, and in many others, the identification of the δαίμονες or gods of the heathen with the δαίμονες or δαιμόνια, "evil spirits," or angels, supposed to be mentioned in Gen. vi. 2.

[2] The reading in the text is αὐτομολεῖν, on which Bohereau, with whom the Benedictine editor agrees, remarks that we must either read αὐτομολήσοντας, or understand some such word as ἑτοίμους before αὐτομολεῖν.

[3] τὸ μεῖζον αὐτόθεν.

[4] μέχρι λόγου.

visible presence. But if this result has not taken place, and if, on the contrary, they have suffered countless calamities rather than renounce Judaism and their law, and have been cruelly treated, at one time in Assyria, at another in Persia, and at another under Antiochus, is it not in keeping with the probabilities of the case[1] for those to suppose who do not yield their belief to their miraculous histories and prophecies, that the events in question could not be inventions, but that a certain divine Spirit being in the holy souls of the prophets, as of men who underwent any labour for the cause of virtue, *did* move them to prophesy some things relating to their contemporaries, and others to their posterity, but chiefly regarding a certain personage who was to come as a Saviour to the human race?

Chapter IV.

And if the above be the state of the case, how do Jews and Christians search after "the shadow of an ass," in seeking to ascertain from those prophecies which they believe in common, whether He who was foretold has come, or has not yet arrived, and is still an object of expectation? But even suppose[2] it be granted to Celsus that it was not Jesus who was announced by the prophets, then, even on such a hypothesis, the investigation of the sense of the prophetic writings is no search after "the shadow of an ass," if he who was spoken of can be clearly pointed out, and it can be shown both what sort of person he was predicted to be, and what he was to do, and, if possible, when he was to arrive. But in the preceding pages we have already spoken on the point of Jesus being the individual who was foretold to be the Christ, quoting a few prophecies out of a larger number. Neither Jews nor Christians, then, are wrong in assuming that the prophets spoke under divine influence;[3] but they are in error who form erroneous opinions respecting Him who was expected by the prophets to come, and whose person and character were made known in their "true discourses."

Chapter V.

Immediately after these points, Celsus, imagining that the

[1] πῶς οὐχὶ ἐξ εἰκότων κατασκευάζεται. [2] καθ' ὑπόθεσιν. [3] θεόθεν.

Jews are Egyptians by descent, and had abandoned Egypt, after revolting against the Egyptian state, and despising the customs of that people in matters of worship, says that "they suffered from the adherents of Jesus, who believed in Him as the Christ, the same treatment which they had inflicted upon the Egyptians; and that the cause which led to the new state of things[1] in either instance was rebellion against the state." Now let us observe what Celsus has here done. The ancient Egyptians, after inflicting many cruelties upon the Hebrew race, who had settled in Egypt owing to a famine which had broken out in Judea, suffered, in consequence of their injustice to strangers and suppliants, that punishment which divine Providence had decreed was to fall on the whole nation for having combined against an entire people, who had been their guests, and who had done them no harm; and after being smitten by plagues from God, they allowed them, with difficulty, and after a brief period, to go wherever they liked, as being unjustly detained in slavery. Because, then, they were a selfish people, who honoured those who were in any degree related to them far more than they did strangers of better lives, there is not an accusation which they have omitted to bring against Moses and the Hebrews,—not altogether denying, indeed, the miracles and wonders done by him, but alleging that they were wrought by sorcery, and not by divine power. Moses, however, not as a magician, but as a devout man, and one devoted to the God of all things, and a partaker in the divine Spirit, both enacted laws for the Hebrews, according to the suggestions of the Divinity, and recorded events as they happened with perfect fidelity.

Chapter VI.

Celsus, therefore, not investigating in a spirit of impartiality the facts, which are related by the Egyptians in one way, and by the Hebrews in another, but being bewitched, as it were,[2] in favour of the former, accepted as true the statements of those who had oppressed the strangers, and declared that the Hebrews, who had been unjustly treated, had departed from Egypt after revolting against the Egyptians,—not observing how

[1] Τῆς καινοτομίας.

[2] Προκαταληφθεὶς ὡς ὑπὸ φίλτρων τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

impossible it was for so great a multitude of rebellious Egyptians to become a nation, which, dating its origin from the said revolt, should change its language at the time of its rebellion, so that those who up to that time made use of the Egyptian tongue, should completely adopt, all at once, the language of the Hebrews! Let it be granted, however, according to his supposition, that on abandoning Egypt they did conceive a hatred also of their mother tongue,[1] how did it happen that after so doing they did not rather adopt the Syrian or Phœnician language, instead of preferring the Hebrew, which is different from both? But reason seems to me to demonstrate that the statement is false, which makes those who were Egyptians by race to have revolted against Egyptians, and to have left the country, and to have proceeded to Palestine, and occupied the land now called Judea. For Hebrew was the language of their fathers before their descent into Egypt; and the Hebrew letters, employed by Moses in writing those five books which are deemed sacred by the Jews, were different from those of the Egyptians.

Chapter VII.

In like manner, as the statement is false "that the Hebrews, being [originally] Egyptians, dated the commencement [of their political existence] from the time of their rebellion," so also is this, "that in the days of Jesus others who were Jews rebelled against the Jewish state, and became His followers;" for neither Celsus nor they who think with him are able to point out any act on the part of Christians which savours of rebellion. And yet, if a revolt had led to the formation of the Christian commonwealth, so that it derived its existence in this way from that of the Jews, who were permitted to take up arms in defence of the members of their families, and to slay their enemies, the Christian Lawgiver would not have altogether forbidden the putting of men to death; and yet He nowhere teaches that it is right for His own disciples to offer violence to any one, however wicked. For He did not deem it in keeping with such laws as His, which were derived from a divine source, to allow the killing of any individual whatever. Nor would

[1] Τὴν σύντροφον φωνήν.

the Christians, had they owed their origin to a rebellion, have adopted laws of so exceedingly mild a character as not to allow them, when it was their fate to be slain as sheep, on any occasion to resist their persecutors. And truly, if we look a little deeper into things, we may say regarding the exodus from Egypt, that it is a miracle if a whole nation *at once* adopted the language called Hebrew, as if it had been a gift from heaven, when one of their own prophets said, "As they went forth from Egypt, they heard a language which they did not understand."[1]

Chapter viii.

In the following way, also, we may conclude that they who came out of Egypt with Moses were not Egyptians; for if they had been Egyptians, their *names* also would be Egyptian, because in every language the designations [of persons and things] are kindred to the language.[2] But if it is certain, from the names being Hebrew, that the people were not Egyptians,—and the Scriptures are full of Hebrew names, and these bestowed, too, upon their children while they were in Egypt,—it is clear that the Egyptian account is false, which asserts that they were Egyptians, and went forth from Egypt with Moses. Now it is absolutely certain[3] that, being descended, as the Mosaic history records, from Hebrew ancestors, they employed a language from which they also took the names which they conferred upon their children. But with regard to the Christians, because they were taught not to avenge themselves upon their enemies (and have thus observed laws of a mild and philanthropic character); and because they would not, although able, have made war even if they had received authority to do so,—they have obtained this reward from God, that He has always warred in their behalf, and on certain occasions has restrained those who rose up against them and desired to destroy them. For in order to remind others, that by seeing a *few* engaged in a struggle for their religion, they also might be better fitted to despise death, some, on special occasions, and these individuals who can be easily numbered, have endured death for the sake of Christianity,—God not permitting the

[1] Cf. Ps. lxxxi. 5. [2] Συγγενεῖς εἰσιν αἱ προσηγορίαι. [3] Σαφῶς ἐναργές.

whole nation to be exterminated, but desiring that it should continue, and that the whole world should be filled with this salutary and religious doctrine. And again, on the other hand, that those who were of weaker minds might recover their courage and rise superior to the thought of death, God interposed His providence on behalf of believers, dispersing by an act of His will alone all the conspiracies formed against them; so that neither kings, nor rulers, nor the populace, might be able to rage against them beyond a certain point. Such, then, is our answer to the assertions of Celsus, "that a revolt was the original commencement of the ancient Jewish state, and subsequently of Christianity."

Chapter IX.

But since he is manifestly guilty of falsehood in the statements which follow, let us examine his assertion when he says, "If all men wished to become Christians, the latter would not desire such a result." Now that the above statement is false is clear from this, that Christians do not neglect, as far as in them lies, to take measures to disseminate their doctrine throughout the whole world. Some of them, accordingly, have made it their business to itinerate not only through cities, but even villages and country houses,[1] that they might make converts to God. And no one would maintain that they did this for the sake of gain, when sometimes they would not accept even necessary sustenance; or if at any time they were pressed by a necessity of this sort, were contented with the mere supply of their wants, although many were willing to share [their abundance] with them, and to bestow help upon them far above their need. At the present day, indeed, when, owing to the multitude of Christian believers, not only rich men, but persons of rank, and delicate and high-born ladies, receive the teachers of Christianity, some perhaps will dare to say that it is for the sake of a little glory[2] that certain individuals assume the office of Christian instructors. It is impossible, however, rationally to entertain such a suspicion with respect to Christianity in its beginnings, when the danger incurred, especially by its teachers, was great; while at the present day the discredit

[1] Ἐπαύλεις. [2] Δοξάριον.

attaching to it among the rest of mankind is greater than any supposed honour enjoyed among those who hold the same belief, especially when such honour is not shared by all. It is false, then, from the very nature of the case, to say that "if all men wished to become Christians, the latter would not desire such a result."

Chapter x.

But observe what he alleges as a proof of his statement: "Christians at first were few in number, and held the same opinions; but when they grew to be a great multitude, they were divided and separated, each wishing to have his own individual party:[1] for this was their object from the beginning." That Christians at first were few in number, in comparison with the multitudes who subsequently became Christian, is undoubted; and yet, all things considered, they were not so very few.[2] For what stirred up the envy of the Jews against Jesus, and aroused them to conspire against Him, was the great number of those who followed Him into the wilderness,—five thousand men on one occasion, and four thousand on another, having attended Him thither, without including the women and children. For such was the charm[3] of Jesus' words, that not only were *men* willing to follow Him to the wilderness, but *women* also, forgetting[4] the weakness of their sex and a regard for outward propriety[5] in thus following their Teacher into desert places. Children, too, who are altogether unaffected by such emotions,[6] either following their parents, or perhaps attracted also by His divinity, in order that it might be implanted within them, became His followers along with their parents. But let it be granted that Christians were few in number at the beginning, how does that help to prove that Christians would be unwilling to make all men believe the doctrine of the gospel?

[1] στάσεις ἰδίας. [2] καί τοι οὐ πάντη ἦσαν ὀλίγοι. [3] ἴυγξ.

[4] The reading in Spencer's and the Benedictine edition is ὑποτεμνομένας, for which Lommatzsch reads ὑπομεμνημένας.

[5] καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν. [6] ἀπαθέστατα.

Chapter XI.

He says, in addition, that "all the Christians were of one mind," not observing, even in this particular, that from the beginning there were differences of opinion among believers regarding the meaning[1] of the books held to be divine. At all events, while the apostles were still preaching, and while eye-witnesses of [the works of] Jesus were still teaching His doctrine, there was no small discussion among the converts from Judaism regarding Gentile believers, on the point whether they ought to observe Jewish customs, or should reject the burden of clean and unclean meats, as not being obligatory on those who had abandoned their ancestral Gentile customs, and had become believers in Jesus. Nay, even in the epistles of Paul, who was contemporary with those who had seen Jesus, certain particulars are found mentioned as having been the subject of dispute,—viz. respecting the resurrection,[2] and whether it were already past, and the day of the Lord, whether it were nigh at hand[3] or not. Nay, the very exhortation to "avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing, have erred concerning the faith,"[4] is enough to show that from the very beginning, when, as Celsus imagines, believers were few in number, there were certain doctrines interpreted in different ways.[5]

Chapter XII.

In the next place, since he reproaches us with the existence of heresies in Christianity as being a ground of accusation against it, saying that "when Christians had greatly increased in numbers, they were divided and split up into factions, each individual desiring to have his own party;" and further, that "being thus separated through their numbers, they confute one another, still having, so to speak, one *name* in common, if indeed they still retain it. And this is the only thing which they are yet ashamed to abandon, while other matters are determined in different ways by the various sects." In reply to which, we say that heresies of different kinds have never

[1] Ἐκδοχήν. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 12 sqq. [3] Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 2.
[4] Cf. 1 Tim. vi. 20, [5] Τινες παρεκδοχαί.

originated from any matter in which the principle involved was not important and beneficial to human life. For since the science of medicine is useful and necessary to the human race, and many are the points of dispute in it respecting the manner of curing bodies, there are found, for this reason, numerous heresies confessedly prevailing in the science of medicine among the Greeks, and also, I suppose, among those barbarous nations who profess to employ medicine. And, again, since philosophy makes a profession of the truth, and promises a knowledge of existing things with a view to the regulation of life, and endeavours to teach what is advantageous to our race, and since the investigation of these matters is attended with great differences of opinion,[1] innumerable heresies have consequently sprung up in philosophy, some of which are more celebrated than others. Even Judaism itself afforded a pretext for the origination of heresies, in the different acceptation accorded to the writings of Moses and those of the prophets. So, then, seeing Christianity appeared an object of veneration to men, not to the more servile class alone, as Celsus supposes, but to many among the Greeks who were devoted to literary pursuits,[2] there necessarily originated heresies,—not at all, however, as the result of faction and strife, but through the earnest desire of many literary men to become acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity. The consequence of which was, that, taking in different acceptations those discourses which were believed by all to be divine, there arose heresies, which received their names from those individuals who admired, indeed, the origin of Christianity, but who were led, in some way or other, by certain plausible reasons, to discordant views. And yet no one would act rationally in avoiding medicine because of its heresies; nor would he who aimed at that which is seemly[3] entertain a hatred of philosophy, and adduce its many heresies as a pretext for his antipathy. And so neither are the sacred books of Moses and the prophets to be condemned on account of the heresies in Judaism.

Chapter XIII.

Now, if these arguments hold good, why should we not

[1] πολλὴν ἔχει διολκήν. [2] φιλολόγων. [3] τὸ πρέπον.

defend, in the same way, the existence of heresies in Christianity? And respecting these, Paul appears to me to speak in a very striking manner when he says, "For there must be heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you."[1] For as that man is "approved" in medicine who, on account of his experience in various [medical] heresies, and his honest examination of the majority of them, has selected the preferable system,—and as the great proficient in philosophy is he who, after acquainting himself experimentally with the various views, has given in his adhesion to the best,—so I would say that the wisest Christian was he who had carefully studied the heresies both of Judaism and Christianity. Whereas he who finds fault with Christianity because of its heresies would find fault also with the teaching of Socrates, from whose school have issued many others of discordant views. Nay, the opinions of Plato might be chargeable with error, on account of Aristotle's having separated from his school, and founded a new one,—on which subject we have remarked in the preceding book. But it appears to me that Celsus has become acquainted with certain heresies which do not possess even the *name* of Jesus in common with us. Perhaps he had heard of the sects called Ophites and Cainites, or some others of a similar nature, which had departed in all points from the teaching of Jesus. And yet surely this furnishes no ground for a charge against the *Christian* doctrine.

Chapter XIV.

After this he continues: "Their union is the more wonderful, the more it can be shown to be based on no substantial reason. And yet rebellion is a substantial reason, as well as the advantages which accrue from it, and the fear of external enemies. Such are the causes which give stability to their faith." To this we answer, that our union does thus rest upon a reason, or rather not upon a reason, but upon the divine working,[2] so that its commencement was God's teaching men, in the prophetical writings, to expect the advent of Christ, who was to be the Saviour of mankind. For in so far as this point is not really refuted (although it may *seem* to be by unbelievers), in the

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 19. [2] θείας ἐνεργείας.

same proportion is the doctrine commended as the doctrine of God, and Jesus shown to be the Son of God both before and after His incarnation. I maintain, moreover, that even after His incarnation, He is always found by those who possess the acutest spiritual vision to be most God-like, and to have really come down to us from God, and to have derived His origin or subsequent development not from human wisdom, but from the manifestation[1] of God within Him, who by His manifold wisdom and miracles established Judaism first, and Christianity afterwards; and the assertion that rebellion, and the advantages attending it, were the originating causes of a doctrine which has converted and improved so many men was effectually refuted.

Chapter xv.

But again, that it is not the fear of external enemies which strengthens our union, is plain from the fact that this cause, by God's will, has already, for a considerable time, ceased to exist. And it is probable that the secure existence, so far as regards the world, enjoyed by believers at present, will come to an end, since those who calumniate Christianity in every way are again attributing the present frequency of rebellion to the multitude of believers, and to their not being persecuted by the authorities as in old times. For we have learned from the gospel neither to relax our efforts in days of peace, and to give ourselves up to repose, nor, when the world makes war upon us, to become cowards, and apostatize from the love of the God of all things which is in Jesus Christ. And we clearly manifest the illustrious nature of our origin, and do not (as Celsus imagines) conceal it, when we impress upon the minds of our first converts a contempt for idols, and images of all kinds, and, besides this, raise their thoughts from the worship of created things instead of God, and elevate them to the universal Creator; clearly showing Him to be the subject of prophecy, both from the predictions regarding Him—of which there are many—and from those traditions which have been carefully investigated by such as are able intelligently to understand the Gospels, and the declarations of the apostles.

[1] ἐπιφανείας.

Chapter XVI.

"But what the legends are of every kind which we gather together, or the terrors which we invent," as Celsus without proof asserts, he who likes may show. I know not, indeed, what he means by "inventing terrors," unless it be our doctrine of God as Judge, and of the condemnation of men for their deeds, with the various proofs derived partly from Scripture, partly from probable reason. And yet—for truth is precious—Celsus says, at the close, "Forbid that either I, or these, or any other individual should ever reject the doctrine respecting the future punishment of the wicked and the reward of the good!" What terrors, then, if you except the doctrine of punishment, do we invent and impose upon mankind? And if he should reply that "we weave together erroneous opinions drawn from ancient sources, and trumpet them aloud, and sound them before men, as the priests of Cybele clash their cymbals in the ears of those who are being initiated in their mysteries;"[1] we shall ask him in reply, "Erroneous opinions from what ancient sources?" For, whether he refers to Grecian accounts, which taught the existence of courts of justice under the earth, or Jewish, which, among other things, predicted the life that follows the present one; he will be unable to show that we who, striving to believe on grounds of reason, regulate our lives in conformity with such doctrines, have failed correctly to ascertain the truth.[2]

Chapter XVII.

He wishes, indeed, to compare the articles of our faith to those of the Egyptians; "among whom, as you approach their sacred edifices, are to be seen splendid enclosures, and groves, and large and beautiful gateways,[3] and wonderful temples, and magnificent tents around them, and ceremonies of worship full of superstition and mystery; but when you have entered, and

[1] τὰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ λόγου παρακούσματα συμπλάττοντες, τούτοις προκαταυλοῦμεν καὶ προκατηχοῦμεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· ὡς οἱ τοὺς κορυβαντιζομένους περιβομβοῦντες.

[2] οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι παραστῆσαι, ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐν παρακούσμασι γενόμενοι τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅσοι γε πειρώμεθα μετὰ λόγου πιστεύειν, πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα ζῶμεν δόγματα.

[3] προπυλαίων μεγέθη τε καὶ κάλλη.

passed within, the object of worship is seen to be a cat, or an ape, or a crocodile, or a goat, or a dog!" Now, what is the resemblance[1] between us and the splendours of Egyptian worship which are seen by those who draw near their temples? And where is the resemblance to those irrational animals which are worshipped within, after you pass through the splendid gateways? Are our prophecies, and the God of all things, and the injunctions against images, objects of reverence in the view of Celsus also, and Jesus Christ crucified, the analogue to the worship of the irrational animal? But if he should assert this —and I do not think that he will maintain anything else—we shall reply that we have spoken in the preceding pages at greater length in defence of those charges affecting Jesus, showing that what appeared to have happened to Him in the capacity of His human nature, was fraught with benefit to all men, and with salvation to the whole world.

Chapter xviii.

In the next place, referring to the statements of the Egyptians, who talk loftily about irrational animals, and who assert that they are a sort of symbols of God, or anything else which their prophets, so termed, are accustomed to call them, Celsus says that "an impression is produced in the minds of those who have learned these things; that they have not been initiated in vain;"[2] while with regard to the truths which are taught in our writings to those who have made progress in the study of Christianity (through that which is called by Paul the gift consisting in the "word of wisdom" through the Spirit, and in the "word of knowledge" according to the Spirit), Celsus does not seem even to have formed an idea,[3] judging not only from what he has already said, but from what he subsequently adds in his attack upon the Christian system, when he asserts that Christians "repel every wise man from the doctrine of their faith, and invite only the ignorant and the vulgar;" on which assertions we shall remark in due time, when we come to the proper place.

[1] τὸ ἀνάλογον.

[2] φαντασίαν ἐξαποστέλλειν τοῖς ταῦτα μεμαθηκόσιν, ὅτι μὴ μάτην μεμύηνται.

[3] πεφαντάσθαι.

Chapter XIX.

He says, indeed, that "we ridicule the Egyptians, although they present many by no means contemptible mysteries[1] for our consideration, when they teach us that such rites are acts of worship offered to eternal ideas, and not, as the multitude think, to ephemeral animals; and that we are silly, because we introduce nothing nobler than the goats and dogs of the Egyptian worship in our narratives about Jesus." Now to this we reply, "Good sir,[2] [suppose that] you are right in eulogizing the fact that the Egyptians present to view many by no means contemptible mysteries, and obscure explanations about the animals [worshipped] among them, you nevertheless do not act consistently in accusing us as if you believed that *we* had nothing to state which was worthy of consideration, but that all *our* doctrines were contemptible and of no account, seeing we unfold[3] the narratives concerning Jesus according to the 'wisdom of the word' to those who are 'perfect' in Christianity. Regarding whom, as being competent to understand the wisdom that is in Christianity, Paul says: 'We speak wisdom among them that are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, who come to nought, but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew.'"[4]

Chapter XX.

And we say to those who hold similar opinions to those of Celsus: "Paul then, we are to suppose, had before his mind the idea of no pre-eminent wisdom when he professed to speak wisdom among them that are perfect?" Now, as he spoke with his customary boldness when in making such a profession he said that *he* was possessed of no wisdom, we shall say in reply: first of all examine the epistles of him who utters these words, and look carefully at the meaning of each expression in them—say, in those to the Ephesians, and Colossians, and Thessalonians, and Philippians, and Romans,—and show two things, both that you understand Paul's words, and that you

[1] αἰνίγματα. [2] ὦ γενναῖε. [3] διεξοδεύωμεν. [4] 1 Cor. ii. 6–8.

can demonstrate any of them to be silly or foolish. For if any one give himself to their attentive perusal, I am well assured either that he will be amazed at the understanding of the man who can clothe great ideas in common language; or if he be not amazed, he will only exhibit himself in a ridiculous light, whether he simply state the meaning of the writer as if he had comprehended it, or try to controvert and confute what he only imagined that he understood!

Chapter XXI.

And I have not yet spoken of the observance[1] of all that is written in the Gospels, each one of which contains much doctrine difficult to be understood, not merely by the multitude, but even by certain of the more intelligent, including a very profound explanation of the parables which Jesus delivered to "those without," while reserving the exhibition of their full meaning[2] for those who had passed beyond the stage of exoteric teaching, and who came to Him privately in the house. And when he comes to understand it, he will admire the reason why some are said to be "without," and others "in the house." And again, who would not be filled with astonishment that is able to comprehend the movements[3] of Jesus; ascending at one time a mountain for the purpose of delivering certain discourses, or of performing certain miracles, or for His own transfiguration, and descending again to heal the sick and those who were unable to follow Him whither His disciples went? But it is not the appropriate time to describe at present the truly venerable and divine contents of the Gospels, or the mind of Christ—that is, the wisdom and the word—contained in the writings of Paul. But what we have said is sufficient by way of answer to the unphilosophic sneers[4] of Celsus, in comparing the inner mysteries of the church of God to the cats, and apes, and crocodiles, and goats, and dogs of Egypt.

Chapter XXII.

But this low jester[5] Celsus, omitting no species of mockery and ridicule which can be employed against us, mentions in his

[1] τηρήσεως. [2] σαφήνειαν. [3] μεταβάσεις.
[4] ἀφιλόσοφον χλεύην. [5] βωμολόχος.

treatise the Dioscuri, and Hercules, and Æsculapius, and Dionysus, who are believed by the Greeks to have become gods after being men, and says that "we cannot bear to call such beings gods, because they were at first men,[1] and yet they manifested many noble qualities, which were displayed for the benefit of mankind, while we assert that Jesus was seen after His death by His own followers;" and he brings against us an additional charge, as if we said that "He was seen indeed, but was only a shadow!" Now to this we reply, that it was very artful of Celsus not here clearly to indicate that he did not regard these beings as gods, for he was afraid of the opinion of those who might peruse his treatise, and who might suppose him to be an atheist; whereas, if he had paid respect to what appeared to him to be the truth, he would not have *feigned* to regard them as gods.[2] Now to either of the allegations we are ready with an answer. Let us, accordingly, to those who do *not* regard them as gods reply as follows: These beings, then, are not gods at all; but agreeably to the view of those who think that the soul of man perishes immediately [after death], the souls of these men also perished; or according to the opinion of those who say that the soul continues to subsist or is immortal, these men continue to exist or are immortal, and they are not gods but heroes,—or not even heroes, but simply souls. If, then, on the one hand, you suppose them *not* to exist, we shall have to prove the doctrine of the soul's immortality, which is to us a doctrine of pre-eminent importance;[3] if, on the other, they *do* exist, we have *still* to prove[4] the doctrine of immortality, not only by what the Greeks have so well said regarding it, but also in a manner agreeable to the teaching of Holy Scripture. And we shall demonstrate that it is impossible for those who were polytheists during their lives to obtain

[1] The reading in the text is *καὶ πρῶτοι*, for which Bohereau proposes *τὸ πρῶτον*, which we have adopted in the translation.

[2] We have followed in the translation the emendation of Guietus, who proposes *εἰ δὲ τὴν φαινομένην αὐτῷ ἀλήθειαν ἐπρέσβευσεν, οὐκ ἄν*, κ.τ.λ., instead of the textual reading, *εἴ τε τῆς φαινομένης αὐτῷ ἀληθείας ἐπρέσβευσεν, οὐκ ἄν*, κ.τ.λ.

[3] *τὸν προηγούμενον ἡμῖν περὶ ψυχῆς κατασκευαστέον λόγον.*

[4] Bohereau conjectures, with great probability, that instead of *ἀποδέκτεον*, we ought to read *ἀποδεικτέον*.

a better country and position after their departure from this world, by quoting the histories that are related of them, in which is recorded the great dissoluteness of Hercules, and his effeminate bondage with Omphale, together with the statements regarding Æsculapius, that their Zeus struck him dead by a thunderbolt. And of the Dioscuri, it will be said that they die often—

> "At one time live on alternate days, and at another
> Die, and obtain honour equally with the gods."[1]

How, then, can they reasonably imagine that one of these is to be regarded as a god or a hero?

Chapter XXIII.

But we, in proving the facts related of our Jesus from the prophetic Scriptures, and comparing afterwards His history with them, demonstrate that no dissoluteness on his part is recorded. For even they who conspired against Him, and who sought false witnesses to aid them, did not find even any plausible grounds for advancing a false charge against Him, so as to accuse Him of licentiousness; but His death was indeed the result of a conspiracy, and bore no resemblance to the death of Æsculapius by lightning. And what is there that is venerable in the madman Dionysus, and his female garments, that *he* should be worshipped as a god? And if they who would defend such beings betake themselves to allegorical interpretations, we must examine each individual instance, and ascertain whether it is well founded,[2] and also in each particular case, whether those beings can have a real existence, and are deserving of respect and worship who were torn by the Titans, and cast down from their heavenly throne. Whereas our Jesus, who appeared to the members of His own troop[3]—for I will take the word that Celsus employs—did *really* appear, and Celsus makes a false accusation against the gospel in saying that what appeared was a shadow. And let the statements of their histories and that of Jesus be carefully compared together. Will Celsus have the former to be true, but the latter, although recorded by eye-witnesses who showed by their acts that they

[1] Cf. Hom. *Odyss.* xi. 303 and 304.

[2] *εἰ τὸ ὑγιὲς ἔχουσιν.*

[3] *θιασωταῖς.*

clearly understood the nature of what they had seen, and who manifested their state of mind by what they cheerfully underwent for the sake of His gospel, to be inventions? Now, who is there that, desiring to act always in conformity with right reason, would yield his assent at random[1] to what is related of the one, but would rush to the history of Jesus, and without examination refuse to believe what is recorded of Him?[2]

Chapter XXIV.

And again, when it is said of Æsculapius that a great multitude both of Greeks and barbarians acknowledge that they have frequently seen, and still see, no mere phantom, but Æsculapius himself, healing and doing good, and foretelling the future; Celsus requires us to believe this, and finds no fault with the believers in Jesus, when we express our belief in such stories, but when we give our assent to the disciples, and eye-witnesses of the miracles of Jesus, who clearly manifest the honesty of their convictions (because we see their guilelessness, as far as it is possible to see the conscience revealed in writing), we are called by him a set of "silly" individuals, although he cannot demonstrate that an incalculable[3] number, as he asserts, of Greeks and barbarians acknowledge the existence of Æsculapius; while we, if we deem this a matter of importance, can clearly show a countless multitude of Greeks and barbarians who acknowledge the existence of Jesus. And some give evidence of their having received through this faith a marvellous power by the cures which they perform, invoking no other name over those who need their help than that of the God of all things, and of Jesus, along with a mention of His history. For by these means we too have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities, and from distractions of mind,[4] and madness, and countless other ills, which could be cured neither by men nor devils.

Chapter XXV.

Now, in order to grant that there did exist a healing spirit

[1] ἀποκληρωτικῶς.

[2] εἰς δὲ τὰ περὶ τούτου ἀνεξετάστως ὁρμῶν ἀπιστήσαι τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ.

[3] ἀμυθήτου.

[4] ἐκστάσεων.

named Æsculapius, who used to cure the bodies of men, I would say to those who are astonished at such an occurrence, or at the prophetic knowledge of Apollo, that since the cure of bodies is a thing indifferent,[1] and a matter within the reach not merely of the good,[2] but also of the bad; and as the foreknowledge of the future is also a thing indifferent—for the possessor of foreknowledge does not necessarily manifest the possession of virtue—you must show that they who practise healing or who foretell the future are in no respect wicked, but exhibit a perfect pattern of virtue, and are not far from being regarded as gods. But they will *not* be able to show that they are virtuous who practise the art of healing, or who are gifted with foreknowledge, seeing many who are not fit to live are related to have been healed; and these, too, persons whom, as leading improper lives, no wise physician would wish to heal. And in the responses of the Pythian oracle also you may find some injunctions which are not in accordance with reason, two of which we will adduce on the present occasion; viz. when it gave commandment that Cleomedes[3]—the boxer, I suppose—should be honoured with divine honours, seeing some great importance or other attaching to his pugilistic skill, but did not confer either upon Pythagoras or upon Socrates the honours which it awarded to pugilism; and also when it called Archilochus "the servant of the Muses"—a man who employed his poetic powers upon topics of the most wicked and licentious nature, and whose public character was dissolute and impure—and entitled him "pious,"[4] in respect of his being the servant of the Muses, who are deemed to be goddesses! Now I am inclined to think that no one would assert that he was a "pious" man who was not adorned with all moderation and virtue, or that a decorous[5] man would utter such expressions as are contained in the unseemly[6] iambics of Archilochus. And if nothing that is divine in itself is shown to belong either to the healing skill of Æsculapius or the prophetic power of Apollo, how could any one, even were I to grant that the facts are as alleged, reasonably worship them as pure divinities?—and especially when the prophetic spirit of Apollo, pure from any body of earth, secretly enters through

[1] μέσον. [2] ἀστείους. [3] Cf. Smith's *Dict. of Biograph. s.v.*
[4] εὐσεβῆ. [5] κόσμιος. [6] οἱ μὴ σεμνοί.

the private parts the person of her who is called the priestess, as she is seated at the mouth of the Pythian cave![1] Whereas regarding Jesus and His power we have no such notion; for the body which was born of the Virgin was composed of human material, and capable of receiving human wounds and death.

Chapter XXVI.

Let us see what Celsus says next, when he adduces from history marvellous occurrences, which in themselves seem to be incredible, but which are not discredited by him, so far at least as appears from his words. And, in the first place, regarding Aristeas of Proconnesus, of whom he speaks as follows: "Then, with respect to Aristeas of Proconnesus, who disappeared from among men in a manner so indicative of divine intervention,[2] and who showed himself again in so unmistakeable a fashion, and on many subsequent occasions visited many parts of the world, and announced marvellous events, and whom Apollo enjoined the inhabitants of Metapontium to regard as a god, no one considers him to be a god." This account he appears to have taken from Pindar and Herodotus. It will be sufficient, however, at present to quote the statement of the latter writer from the fourth book of his histories, which is to the following effect: "Of what country Aristeas, who made these verses, was, has already been mentioned, and I shall now relate the account I heard of him in Proconnesus and Cyzicus. They say that Aristeas, who was inferior to none of the citizens by birth, entering into a fuller's shop in Proconnesus, died suddenly, and that the fuller, having closed his workshop, went to acquaint the relatives of the deceased. When the report had spread through the city that Aristeas was dead, a certain Cyzicenian, arriving from Artace, fell into a dispute with those who made the report, affirming that he had met and conversed with him on his way to Cyzicus, and he vehemently disputed

[1] ὅτε διὰ τοῦ Πυθίου στομίου περικαθεζομένῃ τῇ καλουμένῃ προφήτιδι πνεῦμα διὰ τῶν γυναικείων ὑπεισέρχεται τὸ μαντικόν, ὁ Ἀπόλλων, τὸ καθαρὸν ἀπὸ γηΐνου σώματος. Boherellus conjectures τὸ μαντικὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ καθαρόν.

[2] οὕτω δαιμονίως.

the truth of the report; but the relations of the deceased went to the fuller's shop, taking with them what was necessary for the purpose of carrying the body away; but when the house was opened, Aristeas was not to be seen, either dead or alive. They say that afterwards, in the seventh year, he appeared in Proconnesus, composed those verses which by the Greeks are now called Arimaspian, and having composed them, disappeared a second time. Such is the story current in these cities. But these things I know happened to the Metapontines in Italy 340 years after the second disappearance of Aristeas, as I discovered by computation in Proconnesus and Metapontium. The Metapontines say that Aristeas himself, having appeared in their country, exhorted them to erect an altar to Apollo, and to place near it a statue bearing the name of Aristeas the Proconnesian; for he said that Apollo had visited their country only of all the Italians, and that he himself, who was now Aristeas, accompanied him; and that when he accompanied the god he was a crow; and after saying this he vanished. And the Metapontines say they sent to Delphi to inquire of the god what the apparition of the man meant; but the Pythian bade them obey the apparition, and if they obeyed it would conduce to their benefit. They accordingly, having received this answer, fulfilled the injunctions. And now, a statue bearing the name of Aristeas is placed near the image of Apollo, and around it laurels are planted: the image is placed in the public square. Thus much concerning Aristeas."[1]

Chapter xxvii.

Now, in answer to this account of Aristeas, we have to say, that if Celsus had adduced it as history, without signifying his own assent to its truth, it is in a different way that we should have met his argument. But since he asserts that he "disappeared through the intervention of the divinity," and "showed himself again in an unmistakeable manner," and "visited many parts of the world," and "made marvellous announcements;" and, moreover, that there was "an oracle of Apollo, enjoining the Metapontines to treat Aristeas as a god," he gives the accounts relating to him as upon his own authority, and with his full

[1] Herod. book iv. chap. 14 and 15 (Cary's transl.).

assent. And [this being the case], we ask, How is it possible that, while supposing the marvels related by the disciples of Jesus regarding their Master to be wholly fictitious, and finding fault with those who believe them, you, O Celsus, do not regard these stories of yours to be either products of jugglery[1] or inventions? And how,[2] while charging others with an irrational belief in the marvels recorded of Jesus, can you show yourself justified in giving credence to such statements as the above, without producing some proof or evidence of the alleged occurrences having taken place? Or do Herodotus and Pindar appear to you to speak the truth, while they who have made it their concern to *die* for the doctrine of Jesus, and who have left to their successors writings so remarkable on the truths which they believed, entered upon a struggle for the sake of "fictions" (as you consider them), and "myths," and "juggleries," which entails a life of danger and a death of violence? Place yourself, then, as a neutral party, between what is related of Aristeas and what is recorded of Jesus, and see whether, from the result, and from the benefits which have accrued to the reformation of morals, and to the worship of the God who is over all things, it is not allowable to conclude that we must believe the events recorded of Jesus not to have happened without the divine intervention, but that this was not the case with the story of Aristeas the Proconnesian.

Chapter XXVIII.

For with what purpose in view did Providence accomplish the marvels related of Aristeas? And to confer what benefit upon the human race did such remarkable events, as you regard them, take place? You cannot answer. But we, when we relate the events of the history of Jesus, have no ordinary defence to offer for their occurrence;—this, viz., that God desired to commend the doctrine of Jesus as a doctrine which was to save mankind, and which was based, indeed, upon the apostles as foundations of the rising[3] edifice of Christianity, but which increased in magnitude also in the succeeding ages,

[1] τερατείαν.

[2] Guietus conjectures, καὶ πῶς, ὦ λῷστε.

[3] τῆς καταβαλλομένης οἰκοδομῆς.

in which not a few cures are wrought in the name of Jesus, and certain other manifestations of no small moment have taken place. Now what sort of person is Apollo, who enjoined the Metapontines to treat Aristeas as a god? And with what object does he do this? And what advantage was he procuring to the Metapontines from this divine worship, if they were to regard him as a god, who a little ago was a mortal? And yet the recommendations of Apollo (viewed by us as a demon who has obtained the honour of libation and sacrificial odours[1]) regarding this Aristeas appear to you to be worthy of consideration; while those of the God of all things, and of His holy angels, made known beforehand through the prophets —not *after* the birth of Jesus, but *before* He appeared among men—do not stir you up to admiration, not merely of the prophets who received the Divine Spirit, but of Him also who was the object of their predictions, whose entrance into life was so clearly predicted many years beforehand by numerous prophets, that the whole Jewish people who were hanging in expectation of the coming of Him who was looked for, did, after the advent of Jesus, fall into a keen dispute with each other; and that a great multitude of them acknowledged Christ, and believed Him to be the object of prophecy, while others did not believe in Him, but, despising the meekness of those who, on account of the teaching of Jesus, were unwilling to cause even the most trifling sedition, dared to inflict on Jesus those cruelties which His disciples have so truthfully and candidly recorded, without secretly omitting from their marvellous history of Him what seems to the multitude to bring disgrace upon the doctrine of Christianity. But both Jesus Himself and His disciples desired that His followers should believe not merely in His Godhead and miracles, as if He had not also been a partaker of human nature, and had assumed the human flesh which "lusteth against the Spirit;"[2] but they saw also that the power which had descended into human nature, and into the midst of human miseries, and which had assumed a human soul and body, contributed through faith, along with

[1] τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς δαίμονος, λαχόντος γέρας λοιβῆς τε κνίσσης τε.

[2] ὡς οὐ κοινωνήσαντος τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει, οὐδ' ἀναλαβόντος τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις σάρκα ἐπιθυμοῦσαν κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.

its divine elements, to the salvation of believers,[1] when they see that from Him there began the union of the divine with the human nature, in order that the human, by communion with the divine, might rise to be divine, not in Jesus alone, but in all those who not only believe, but[2] enter upon the life which Jesus taught, and which elevates to friendship with God and communion with Him every one who lives according to the precepts of Jesus.

Chapter xxix.

According to Celsus, then, Apollo wished the Metapontines to treat Aristeas as a god. But as the Metapontines considered the evidence in favour of Aristeas being a man—and probably not a virtuous one—to be stronger than the declaration of the oracle to the effect that he was a god or worthy of divine honours, they for that reason would not obey Apollo, and consequently no one regarded Aristeas as a god. But with respect to Jesus we would say that, as it was of advantage to the human race to accept him as the Son of God—God come in a human soul and body—and as this did not seem to be advantageous to the gluttonous appetites[3] of the demons which love bodies, and to those who deem them to be gods on that account, the demons that are on earth (which are supposed to be gods by those who are not instructed in the nature of demons), and also their worshippers, were desirous to prevent the spread of the doctrine of Jesus; for they saw that the libations and odours in which they greedily delighted were being swept away by the prevalence of the instructions of Jesus. But the God who sent Jesus dissipated all the conspiracies of the demons, and made the gospel of Jesus to prevail throughout the whole world for the conversion and reformation of men, and caused churches to be everywhere established in opposition to those of superstitious and licentious and wicked men; for such is the character of the multitudes

[1] Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τὴν καταβᾶσαν εἰς ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν καὶ εἰς ἀνθρωπίνας περιστάσεις δύναμιν, καὶ ἀναλαβοῦσαν ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον, ἐώρων ἐκ τοῦ πιστεύεσθαι μετὰ τῶν θειοτέρων συμβαλλομένην εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.

[2] μετὰ τοῦ πιστεύειν. Others read, μετὰ τὸ πιστεύειν.

[3] λιχνείᾳ.

who constitute the citizens[1] in the assemblies of the various cities. Whereas the churches of God which are instructed by Christ, when carefully contrasted with the assemblies of the districts in which they are situated, are as beacons[2] in the world; for who would not admit that even the inferior members of the church, and those who in comparison with the better are less worthy, are nevertheless more excellent than many of those who belong to the assemblies in the different districts?

Chapter xxx.

For the church[3] of God, *e.g.* which is at Athens, is a meek and stable body, as being one which desires to please God, who is over all things; whereas the assembly[4] of the Athenians is given to sedition, and is not at all to be compared to the church of God in that city. And you may say the same thing of the church of God at Corinth, and of the assembly of the Corinthian people; and also of the church of God at Alexandria, and of the assembly of the people of Alexandria. And if he who hears this be a candid man, and one who investigates things with a desire to ascertain the truth, he will be filled with admiration of Him who not only conceived the design, but also was able to secure in all places the establishment of churches of God alongside[5] of the assemblies of the people in each city. In like manner, also, in comparing the council[6] of the church of God with the council in any city, you would find that certain councillors[7] of the church are worthy to rule in the city of God, if there be any such city in the whole world;[8] whereas the councillors in all other places exhibit in their characters no quality worthy of the conventional[9] superiority which they appear to enjoy over their fellow-citizens. And so, too, you must compare the ruler of the *church* in each city with the

[1] τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ πανταχοῦ πολιτευόμενα ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν πόλεων πλήθη.

[2] φωστῆρες. [3] ἐκκλησία. [4] ἐκκλησία.

[5] παροικούσας. [6] βουλὴν. [7] βουλευταί.

[8] εὕροις ἂν τίνες μὲν τῆς ἐκκλησίας βουλευταὶ ἄξιοί εἰσιν, εἴ τίς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ πάντι πόλις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἐκείνῃ πολιτεύεσθαι. Boherellus conjectures εὕροις ἂν ὅτι τινὲς μὲν, κ.τ.λ.

[9] τῆς ἐκ καταξέως ὑπεροχῆς.

ruler of the *people* of the city, in order to observe that even amongst those councillors and rulers of the church of God who come very far short of their duty, and who lead more indolent lives than others who are more energetic, it is nevertheless possible to discover a general superiority in what relates to the progress of virtue over the characters of the councillors and rulers in the various cities.[1]

Chapter xxxi.

Now if these things be so, why should it not be consistent with reason to hold with regard to Jesus, who was able to effect results so great, that there dwelt in *Him* no ordinary divinity? while this was not the case either with the Proconnesian Aristeas (although Apollo would have him regarded as a god), or with the other individuals enumerated by Celsus when he says, "No one regards Abaris the Hyperborean as a god, who was possessed of such power as to be borne along like an arrow from a bow."[2] For with what object did the deity who bestowed upon this Hyperborean Abaris the power of being carried along like an arrow, confer upon him such a gift? Was it that the human race might be benefited thereby,[3] or did he himself obtain any advantage from the possession of such a power?—always supposing it to be conceded that these statements are not wholly inventions, but that the thing actually happened through the co-operation of some demon. But if it be recorded that my Jesus was received up into glory,[4] I perceive the divine arrangement[5] in such an act, viz. because God, who brought this to pass, commends in this way the Teacher to those who witnessed it, in order that as men who are contending not for human doctrine, but for divine teaching,

[1] *ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα ἀποτυγχανομένων βουλευτῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ, καὶ ῥαθυμότερον παρὰ τοὺς εὐτονωτέρως βιοῦντας, οὐδὲν ἧττόν ἐστιν εὑρεῖν ὡς ἐπίπαν ὑπεροχὴν, τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς προκοπῇ, παρὰ τὰ ἤθη τῶν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι βουλευτῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων.* Boherellus conjectures *ῥαθυμοτέρων.*

[2] *ὥστε οἵστῳ βέλει συμφέρεσθαι.* Spencer and Bohereau would delete *βέλει* as a gloss.

[3] Guietus would insert *ἤ* before *ἵνα τὶ ὠφεληθῇ.* This emendation is adopted in the translation.

[4] Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

[5] *τὴν οἰκονομίαν.*

they may devote themselves as far as possible to the God who is over all, and may do all things in order to please Him, as those who are to receive in the divine judgment the reward of the good or evil which they have wrought in this life.

Chapter xxxii.

But as Celsus next mentions the case of the Clazomenian, subjoining to the story about him this remark, "Do they not report that his soul frequently quitted his body, and flitted about in an incorporeal form? and yet men did not regard him as a god," we have to answer that probably certain wicked demons contrived that such statements should be committed to writing (for I do not believe that they contrived that such a thing should actually *take place*), in order that the predictions regarding Jesus, and the discourses uttered by Him, might either be evil spoken of, as inventions like these, or might excite no surprise, as not being more remarkable than other occurrences. But my Jesus said regarding His own soul (which was separated from the body, not by virtue of any human necessity, but by the miraculous power which was given Him also for this purpose): "No one taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."[1] For as He had power to lay it down, He laid it down when He said, "Father, why hast Thou forsaken me? And when He had cried with a loud voice, He gave up the ghost,"[2] anticipating the public executioners of the crucified, who break the legs of the victims, and who do so in order that their punishment may not be further prolonged. And He "took His life," when He manifested Himself to His disciples, having in their presence foretold to the unbelieving Jews, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again,"[3] and "He spake this of the temple of His body;" the prophets, moreover, having predicted such a result in many other passages of their writings, and in this, "My flesh also shall rest in hope: for Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer thine holy One to see corruption."[4]

[1] Cf. John x. 18.
[2] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 46–50
[3] Cf. John ii. 19.
[4] Ps. xvi. 9, 10.

Chapter XXXIII.

Celsus, however, shows that he has read a good many Grecian histories, when he quotes further what is told of Cleomedes of Astypalea, "who," he relates, "entered into an ark, and although shut up within it, was not found therein, but through some arrangement of the divinity, flew out, when certain persons had cut open the ark in order to apprehend him." Now this story, if an invention, as it appears to be, cannot be compared with what is related of Jesus, since in the lives of such men there is found no indication of their possessing the divinity which is ascribed to them; whereas the divinity of Jesus is established both by the existence of the churches of the saved,[1] and by the prophecies uttered concerning Him, and by the cures wrought in His name, and by the wisdom and knowledge which are in Him, and the deeper truths which are discovered by those who know how to ascend from a simple faith, and to investigate the meaning which lies in the divine Scriptures, agreeably to the injunctions of Jesus, who said, "Search the Scriptures,"[2] and to the wish of Paul, who taught that "we ought to know how to answer every man;"[3] nay, also of him who said, "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh of you a reason of the faith[4] that is in you."[5] If he wishes to have it conceded, however, that it is not a fiction, let him show with what object this supernatural power made him, through some arrangement of the divinity, flee from the ark. For if he will adduce any reason worthy of consideration, and point out any purpose worthy of God in conferring such a power on Cleomedes, we will decide on the answer which we ought to give; but if he fail to say anything convincing on the point, clearly because no reason *can* be discovered, then we shall either speak slightingly of the story to those who have not accepted it, and charge it with being false, or we shall say that some demoniac power, casting a glamour over the eyes, produced, in the case of the Astypalean, a result like that which is produced by the per-

[1] τῶν ὠφελουμένων.
[2] John v. 39.
[3] Cf. Col. iv. 6.
[4] πίστεως.
[5] 1 Pet. iii. 15.

formers of juggling tricks,[1] while Celsus thinks that with respect to him he has spoken like an oracle, when he said that "by some divine arrangement he flew away from the ark."

Chapter xxxiv.

I am, however, of opinion that these individuals are the only instances with which Celsus was acquainted. And yet, that he might appear voluntarily to pass by other similar cases, he says, "And one might name many others of the same kind." Let it be granted, then, that many such persons have existed who conferred no benefit upon the human race: what would each one of their acts be found to amount to in comparison with the work of Jesus, and the miracles related of Him, of which we have already spoken at considerable length? He next imagines that, "in worshipping him who," as *he* says, "was taken prisoner and put to death, we are acting like the Getæ who worship Zamolxis, and the Cilicians who worship Mopsus, and the Acarnanians who pay divine honours to Amphilochus, and like the Thebans who do the same to Amphiaraus, and the Lebadians to Trophonius." Now in these instances we shall prove that he has compared us to the foregoing without good grounds. For these different tribes erected temples and statues to those individuals above enumerated, whereas we have refrained from offering to the divinity honour by any such means (seeing they are adapted rather to demons, which are somehow fixed in a certain place which they prefer to any other, or which take up their dwelling, as it were, after being removed [from one place to another] by certain rites and incantations), and are lost in reverential wonder at Jesus, who has recalled our minds from all sensible things, as being not only corruptible, but destined to corruption, and elevated them to honour the God who is over all with prayers and a righteous life, which we offer to Him as being intermediate between the

[1] ἤτοι διαβαλοῦμεν τοῖς αὐτὴν μὴ παραδεξαμένοις, καὶ ἐγκαλέσομεν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ ὡς οὐκ ἀληθεῖ· ἢ δαιμόνιόν τι φήσομεν παραπλήσιον τοῖς ἐπιδεικνυμένοις γόησιν ἀπατῇ ὀφθαλμῶν πεποιηκέναι καὶ περὶ τὸν Ἀστυπαλαιέα. Spencer in his edition includes μὴ in brackets, and renders, "Aut eos incusabimus, qui istam virtutem admiserint."

nature of the uncreated and that of all created things,[1] and who bestows upon us the benefits which come from the Father, and who as High Priest conveys our prayers to the supreme God.

Chapter xxxv.

But I should like, in answer to him who for some unknown reason advances such statements as the above, to make in a conversational way[2] some such remarks as the following, which seem not inappropriate to him. Are then those persons whom you have mentioned nonentities, and is there no power in Lebadea connected with Trophonius, nor in Thebes with the temple of Amphiaraus, nor in Acarnania with Amphilochus, nor in Cilicia with Mopsus? Or is there in such persons some being, either a demon, or a hero, or even a god, working works which are beyond the reach of man? For if he answer that there is nothing either demoniacal or divine about these individuals more than others, then let him at once make known his own opinion, as being that of an Epicurean, and of one who does not hold the same views with the Greeks, and who neither recognises demons nor worships gods as do the Greeks; and let it be shown that it was to no purpose that he adduced the instances previously enumerated (as if he believed them to be true), together with those which he adds in the following pages. But if he will assert that the persons spoken of are either demons, or heroes, or even gods, let him notice that he will establish by what he has admitted a result which he does not desire, viz. that Jesus also was some such being; for which reason, too, he was able to demonstrate to not a few that He had come down from God to visit the human race. And if he once admit this, see whether he will not be forced to confess that He is mightier than those individuals with whom he classed Him, seeing none of the latter forbids the offering of honour

[1] οἷς προσάγομεν αὐτῷ, ὡς διὰ μεταξὺ ὄντος τῆς τοῦ ἀγενήτου καὶ τῆς τῶν γενητῶν πάντων φύσεως. "Hoeschel (itemque Spencerus ad marg.) suspicabatur legendum: ὡς δὴ μεταξὺ ὄντος. Male. Nihil mutari necesse est. Agitur quippe de precibus, quas offerimus Deo 'per eum, qui veluti medius est inter increatam naturam et creatam.'"—Ruæus.

[2] ἀδολεσχῆσαι.

to the others; while He, having confidence in Himself, because He is more powerful than all those others, forbids them to be received as divine[1] because they are wicked demons, who have taken possession of places on earth, through inability to rise to the purer and diviner region, whither the grossnesses of earth and its countless evils cannot reach.

Chapter XXXVI.

But as he next introduces the case of the favourite of Adrian (I refer to the accounts regarding the youth Antinous, and the honours paid him by the inhabitants of the city of Antinous in Egypt), and imagines that the honour paid to him falls little short of that which we render to Jesus, let us show in what a spirit of hostility this statement is made. For what is there in common between a life lived among the favourites of Adrian, by one who did not abstain even from unnatural lusts, and that of the venerable Jesus, against whom even they who brought countless other charges, and who told so many falsehoods, were not able to allege that He manifested, even in the slightest degree, any tendency to what was licentious?[2] Nay, further, if one were to investigate, in a spirit of truth and impartiality, the stories relating to Antinous, he would find that it was due to the magical arts and rites of the Egyptians that there was even the *appearance* of his performing anything [marvellous] in the city which bears his name, and that too only after his decease,—an effect which is said to have been produced in other temples by the Egyptians, and those who are skilled in the arts which they practise. For they set up in certain places demons claiming prophetic or healing power, and which frequently torture those who seem to have committed any mistake about ordinary kinds of food, or about touching the dead body of a man, that they may have the appearance of alarming the uneducated multitude. Of this nature is the being that is considered to be a god in Antinoopolis in Egypt, whose [reputed] virtues are the lying inventions of some who live by the gain derived therefrom;[3] while others, deceived by the demon placed

[1] τὰς τουτων ἀποδοχὰς.

[2] ὡς κἂν τὸ τυχὸν ἀκολασίας κἂν ἐπ' ὀλιγὸν γευσαμένου;

[3] οὗ ἀρετὰς οἱ μέν τινες κυβευτικώτερον ζῶντες καταψεύδονται.

there, and others again convicted by a weak conscience, actually think that they are paying a divine penalty inflicted by Antinous. Of such a nature also are the mysteries which they perform, and the seeming predictions which they utter. Far different from such are those of Jesus. For it was no company of sorcerers, paying court to a king or ruler at his bidding, who seemed to have made him a god; but the Architect of the universe Himself, in keeping with the marvellously persuasive power of His words,[1] commended Him as worthy of honour, not only to those men who were well disposed, but to demons also, and other unseen powers, which even at the present time show that they either fear the name of Jesus as that of a being of superior power, or reverentially accept Him as their legal ruler.[2] For if the commendation had not been given Him by God, the demons would not have withdrawn from those whom they had assailed, in obedience to the mere mention of His name.

Chapter xxxvii.

The Egyptians, then, having been taught to worship Antinous, will, if you compare him with Apollo or Zeus, endure such a comparison, Antinous being magnified in their estimation through being classed with these deities; for Celsus is clearly convicted of falsehood when he says, "that they will not endure his being compared with Apollo or Zeus." Whereas Christians (who have learned that their eternal life consists in knowing the only true God, who is over all, and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent; and who have learned also that all the gods of the heathen are greedy demons, which flit around sacrifices and blood, and other sacrificial accompaniments,[3] in order to deceive those who have not taken refuge with the God who is over all, but that the divine and holy angels of God are of a different nature and will[4] from all the demons on earth, and that they are known to those exceedingly few persons who have carefully and intelligently investigated these matters) will not endure a comparison to be made between them and Apollo or Zeus, or any being worshipped with odours and blood and

[1] ἀκολούθως τῇ ἐν τῷ λέγειν τεραστίως πιστικῇ δυνάμει.
[2] ὡς κατὰ νόμους αὐτῶν ἄρχοντος.
[3] ἀποφοράς.
[4] προαιρέσεως.

sacrifices; some of them, so acting from their extreme simplicity, not being able to give a reason for their conduct, but sincerely observing the precepts which they have received; others, again, for reasons not to be lightly regarded, nay, even of a profound description, and (as a Greek would say) drawn from the inner nature of things;[1] and amongst the latter of these God is a frequent subject of conversation, and those who are honoured by God, through His only-begotten Word, with participation in His divinity, and therefore also in His name. They speak much, too, both regarding the angels of God and those who are opposed to the truth, but have been deceived; and who, in consequence of being deceived, call them gods or angels of God, or good demons, or heroes who have become such by the transference into them of a good human soul.[2] And such Christians will also show, that as in philosophy there are many who appear to be in possession of the truth, who have yet either deceived themselves by plausible arguments, or by rashly assenting to what was brought forward and discovered by others; so also, among those souls which exist apart from bodies, both angels and demons, there are some which have been induced by plausible reasons to declare themselves gods. And because it was impossible that the reasons of such things could be discovered by men with perfect exactness, it was deemed safe that no mortal should entrust himself to any being as to God, with the exception of Jesus Christ, who is, as it were, the Ruler over all things, and who both beheld these weighty secrets, and made them known to a few.

Chapter xxxviii.

The belief, then, in Antinous, or any other such person, whether among the Egyptians or the Greeks, is, so to speak, unfortunate; while the belief in Jesus would seem to be either a fortunate one, or the result of thorough investigation, having the appearance of the former to the multitude, and of the latter to exceedingly few.[3] And when I speak of a certain belief being, as the multitude would call it, unfortunate, I in

[1] ἐσωτερικῶν καὶ ἐποπτικῶν.

[2] ἢ ἥρωας ἐκ μεταβολῆς συστάντας ἀγαθῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς.

[3] περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἤτοι δόξασα ἂν εἶναι εὐτυχὴς, ἢ καὶ βεβασανισμένως

such a case refer the cause to God, who knows the reasons of the various fates allotted to each one who enters human life. The Greeks, moreover, will admit that even amongst those who are considered to be most largely endowed with wisdom, good fortune has had much to do, as in the choice of teachers of one kind rather than another, and in meeting with a better class of instructors (there being teachers who taught the most opposite doctrines), and in being brought up in better circumstances; for the bringing up of many has been amid surroundings of such a kind, that they were prevented from ever receiving any idea of better things, but constantly passed their life, from their earliest youth, either as the favourites of licentious men or of tyrants, or in some other wretched condition which forbade the soul to look upwards. And the causes of these varied fortunes, according to all probability, are to be found in the reasons of providence, though it is not easy for men to ascertain these; but I have said what I have done by way of digression from the main body of my subject, on account of the proverb, that "such is the power of faith, because it seizes that which first presents itself."[1] For it was necessary, owing to the different methods of education, to speak of the differences of belief among men, some of whom are more, others less fortunate in their belief; and from this to proceed to show that what is termed good or bad fortune would appear to contribute, even in the case of the most talented, to their appearing to be more fully endowed with reason, and to give their assent on grounds of reason to the majority of human opinions. But enough on these points.

Chapter XXXIX.

We must notice the remarks which Celsus next makes, when he says to us, that "faith, having taken possession of our minds, makes us yield the assent which we give to the doctrine of Jesus;" for of a truth it is faith which does produce such an assent. Observe, however, whether that faith does not of itself exhibit what is worthy of praise, seeing we entrust ourselves to

ἐξηταισμένη, δοκοῦσα μὲν εὐτυχὴς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς, βεβασανισμένως δὲ ἐξηταισμένη παρὰ πάνυ ὀλιγωτάτοις.

[1] τοσοῦτον ποιεῖ πίστις, ὁποία δὴ προκαταισχοῦσα.

the God who is over all, acknowledging our gratitude to Him who has led us to such a faith, and declaring that He could not have attempted or accomplished such a result without the divine assistance. And we have confidence also in the intentions of the writers of the Gospels, observing their piety and conscientiousness, manifested in their writings, which contain nothing that is spurious, or deceptive,[1] or false, or cunning; for it is evident to us that souls unacquainted with those artifices which are taught by the cunning sophistry of the Greeks (which is characterized by great plausibility and acuteness), and by the kind of rhetoric in vogue in the courts of justice, would not have been able thus to invent occurrences which are fitted of themselves to conduct to faith, and to a life in keeping with faith. And I am of opinion that it was on this account that Jesus wished to employ such persons as teachers of His doctrines, viz. that there might be no ground for any suspicion of plausible sophistry, but that it might clearly appear to all who were capable of understanding, that the guileless purpose of the writers being, so to speak, marked with great simplicity, was deemed worthy of being accompanied by a diviner power, which accomplished far more than it seemed possible could be accomplished by a periphrasis of words, and a weaving of sentences, accompanied by all the distinctions of Grecian art.

Chapter XL.

But observe whether the principles of our faith, harmonizing with the general ideas implanted in our minds at birth, do not produce a change upon those who listen candidly to its statements; for although a perverted view of things, with the aid of much instruction to the same effect, has been able to implant in the minds of the multitude the belief that images are gods, and that things made of gold, and silver, and ivory, and stone are deserving of worship, yet common sense[2] forbids the supposition that God is at all a piece of corruptible matter, or is honoured when made to assume by men a form embodied in dead matter, fashioned according to some image or symbol of His appearance. And therefore we say at once of images that

[1] κυβευτικόν. [2] ἡ κοινὴ ἔννοια.

they are not gods, and of such creations (of art) that they are not to be compared with the Creator, but are small in contrast with the God who is over all, and who created, and upholds, and governs the universe. And the rational soul recognising, as it were, its relationship [to the divine], at once rejects what it for a time supposed to be gods, and resumes its natural love[1] for its Creator; and because of its affection towards Him, receives Him also who first presented these truths to all nations through the disciples whom He had appointed, and whom He sent forth, furnished with divine power and authority, to proclaim the doctrine regarding God and His kingdom.

Chapter xli.

But since he has charged us, I know not how often already, "with regarding this Jesus, who was but a mortal body, as a God, and with supposing that we act piously in so doing," it is superfluous to say any more in answer to this, as a great deal has been said in the preceding pages. And yet let those who make this charge understand that He whom we regard and believe to have been from the beginning God, and the Son of God, is the very Logos, and the very Wisdom, and the very Truth; and with respect to His mortal body, and the human soul which it contained, we assert that not by their communion merely with Him, but by their unity and intermixture,[2] they received the highest powers, and after participating in His divinity, were changed into God. And if any one should feel a difficulty at our saying this regarding His body, let him attend to what is said by the Greeks regarding matter, which, properly speaking, being without qualities, receives such as the Creator desires to invest it with, and which frequently divests itself of those which it formerly possessed, and assumes others of a different and higher kind. And if these opinions be correct, what is there wonderful in this, that the mortal quality of the body of Jesus, if the providence of God has so willed it, should have been changed into one that was ethereal and divine?

Chapter xlii.

Celsus, then, does not speak as a good reasoner,[3] when he

[1] φίλτρου φυσικόν. [2] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει. [3] διαλεκτικὸς.

compares the mortal flesh of Jesus to gold, and silver, and stone, asserting that the former is more liable to corruption than the latter. For, to speak correctly, that which is incorruptible is not more free from corruption than another thing which is incorruptible, nor that which is corruptible more liable to corruption than another corruptible thing. But, admitting that there are degrees of corruptibility, we can say in answer, that if it is possible for the matter which underlies all qualities to exchange some of them, how should it be impossible for the flesh of Jesus also to exchange qualities, and to become such as it was proper for a body to be which had its abode in the ether and the regions above it, and possessing no longer the infirmities belonging to the flesh, and those properties which Celsus terms "impurities," and in so terming them, speaks unlike a philosopher? For that which is properly impure, is so because of its wickedness. Now the nature of body is not impure; for in so far as it is bodily nature, it does not possess vice, which is the generative principle of impurity. But, as he had a suspicion of the answer which we would return, he says with respect to the change of the body of Jesus, "Well, after he has laid aside these qualities, he will be a God:" [and if so], why not rather Æsculapius, and Dionysus, and Hercules? To which we reply, "What great deed has Æsculapius, or Dionysus, or Hercules wrought?" And what individuals will they be able to point out as having been improved in character, and made better by their words and lives, so that they may make good their claim to be gods? For let us peruse the many narratives regarding them, and see whether they were free from licentiousness, or injustice, or folly, or cowardice. And if nothing of that kind be found in them, the argument of Celsus might have force, which places the forenamed individuals upon an equality with Jesus. But if it is certain that, although some things are reported of them as reputable, they are recorded, nevertheless, to have done innumerable things which are contrary to right reason, how could you any longer say, with any show of reason, that these men, on putting aside their mortal body, became gods rather than Jesus?

Chapter xliii.

He next says of us, that "we ridicule those who worship Jupiter, because his tomb is pointed out in the island of Crete; and yet we worship him who rose from the tomb,[1] although ignorant of the grounds[2] on which the Cretans observe such a custom." Observe now that he thus undertakes the defence of the Cretans, and of Jupiter, and of his tomb, alluding obscurely to the allegorical notions, in conformity with which the myth regarding Jupiter is said to have been invented; while he assails us who acknowledge that our Jesus has been buried, indeed, but who maintain that He has also been *raised* from the tomb,—a statement which the Cretans have not yet made regarding Jupiter. But since he appears to admit that the tomb of Jupiter is in Crete, when he says that "we are ignorant of the grounds on which the Cretans observe such a custom," we reply that Callimachus the Cyrenian, who had read innumerable poetic compositions, and nearly the whole of Greek history, was not acquainted with any allegorical meaning which was contained in the stories about Jupiter and his tomb; and accordingly he accuses the Cretans in his hymn addressed to Jupiter, in the words:[3]

> "The Cretans are always liars: for thy tomb, O king,
> The Cretans have reared; and yet thou didst not die,
> For thou ever livest."

Now he who said, "Thou didst not die, for thou ever livest," in denying that Jupiter's tomb was in Crete, records nevertheless that in Jupiter there was the beginning of death.[4] But birth upon earth is the beginning of death. And his words run:

> "And Rhea bore thee among the Parrhasians;"—

whereas he ought to have seen, after denying that the birth of Jupiter took place in Crete because of his tomb, that it was quite congruous with his birth in Arcadia that he who was born should also die. And the following is the manner in which

[1] τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου.

[2] οὐκ εἰδότες πῶς καὶ καθὸ.

[3] Cf. Callimach. Hymn i. Cf. also Tit. i. 12.

[4] τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ θανάτου γεγονέναι περὶ τὸν Δία.

Callimachus speaks of these things: "O Jupiter, some say that thou wert born on the mountains of Ida, others in Arcadia. Which of them, O father, have lied? The Cretans are always liars," etc. Now it is Celsus who made us discuss these topics, by the unfair manner in which he deals with Jesus, in giving his assent to what is related about His death and burial, but regarding as an invention His resurrection from the dead, although this was not only foretold by innumerable prophets, but many proofs also were given of His having appeared after death.

Chapter xliv.

After these points Celsus quotes some objections against the doctrine of Jesus, made by a very few individuals who are considered Christians, not of the more intelligent, as he supposes, but of the more ignorant class, and asserts that "the following are the rules laid down by them. Let no one come to us who has been instructed, or who is wise or prudent (for such qualifications are deemed evil by us); but if there be any ignorant, or unintelligent, or uninstructed, or foolish persons, let them come with confidence. By which words, acknowledging that such individuals are worthy of their God, they manifestly show that they desire and are able to gain over only the silly, and the mean, and the stupid, with women and children." In reply to which, we say that, as if, while Jesus teaches continence, and says, "Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart," one were to behold a few of those who are deemed to be Christians living licentiously, he would most justly blame them for living contrary to the teaching of Jesus, but would act most unreasonably if he were to charge the gospel with their censurable conduct; so, if he found nevertheless that the doctrine of the Christians invites men to wisdom, the blame then must remain with those who rest in their own ignorance, and who utter, not what Celsus relates (for although some of them are simple and ignorant, they do not speak so shamelessly as he alleges), but other things of much less serious import, which, however, serve to turn aside men from the practice of wisdom.

Chapter XLV.

But that the object of Christianity[1] is that we should become wise, can be proved not only from the ancient Jewish writings, which *we* also use, but especially from those which were composed after the time of Jesus, and which are believed among the churches to be divine. Now, in the fiftieth Psalm, David is described as saying in his prayer to God these words: "The unseen and secret things of Thy wisdom Thou hast manifested to me."[2] Solomon, too, because he asked for wisdom, received it; and if any one were to peruse the Psalms, he would find the book filled with many maxims of wisdom; and the evidences of his wisdom may be seen in his treatises, which contain a great amount of wisdom expressed in few words, and in which you will find many laudations of wisdom, and encouragements towards obtaining it. So wise, moreover, was Solomon, that "the queen of Sheba, having heard his name, and the name of the Lord, came to try him with difficult questions, and spake to him all things, whatsoever were in her heart; and Solomon answered her all her questions. There was no question omitted by the king which he did not answer her. And the queen of Sheba saw all the wisdom of Solomon, and the possessions which he had,[3] and there was no more spirit in her.[4] And she said to the king, The report is true which I heard in mine own land regarding thee and thy wisdom; and I believed not them who told me, until I had come, and mine eyes have seen it. And, lo, they did not tell me the half. Thou hast added wisdom and possessions above all the report which I heard."[5] It is recorded also of him, that "God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea-shore. And the wisdom that was in Solomon greatly excelled the wisdom of all the ancients, and of all the wise men of Egypt; and he was wiser than all men, even than Gethan the Ezrahite, and Emad, and Chalcadi, and Aradab, the sons of Madi. And he was famous among all the nations round

[1] ὁ λόγος.

[2] τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου ἐδήλωσας μοι.

[3] τὰ κατ' αὐτόν. [4] καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγένετο. [5] Cf. 1 Kings x. 1–9.

about. And Solomon spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were five thousand. And he spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even to the hyssop which springeth out of the wall; and also of fishes and of beasts. And all nations came to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and from all the kings of the earth who had heard of the fame of his wisdom."[1]

And to such a degree does the gospel desire that there should be wise men among believers, that for the sake of exercising the understanding of its hearers, it has spoken certain truths in enigmas, others in what are called "dark" sayings, others in parables, and others in problems.[2] And one of the prophets—Hosea—says at the end of his prophecies: "Who is wise, and he will understand these things? or prudent, and he shall know them?"[3] Daniel, moreover, and his fellow-captives, made such progress in the learning which the wise men around the king in Babylon cultivated, that they were shown to excel all of them in a tenfold degree. And in the book of Ezekiel it is said to the ruler of Tyre, who greatly prided himself on his wisdom, "Art thou wiser than Daniel? Every secret was not revealed to thee."[4]

Chapter xlvi.

And if you come to the books written after the time of Jesus, you will find that those multitudes of believers who hear the parables are, as it were, "without," and worthy only of exoteric doctrines, while the disciples learn in private the explanation of the parables. For, privately, to His own disciples did Jesus open up all things, esteeming above the multitudes those who desired to know His wisdom. And He promises to those who believe upon Him to send them wise men and scribes, saying, "Behold, I will send unto you wise men and scribes, and some of them they shall kill and crucify."[5] And Paul also, in the catalogue of "Charismata" bestowed by God, placed first "the word of wisdom," and second, as being inferior to it, "the word

[1] Cf. 1 Kings iv. 29–34. The text reads, *περὶ πάντων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*, for which *παρὰ* has been substituted.

[2] *καὶ ἄλλα διὰ προβλημάτων.*

[3] Hos. x. 9.

[4] Cf. Ezek. xx. 3.

[5] Cf. Matt. xxiii. 34.

of knowledge," but third, and lower down, "faith."[1] And because he regarded "the word" as higher than miraculous powers, he for that reason places "workings of miracles" and "gifts of healings" in a lower place than the gifts of the word. And in the Acts of the Apostles Stephen bears witness to the great learning of Moses, which he had obtained wholly from ancient writings not accessible to the multitude. For he says: "And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."[2] And therefore, with respect to his miracles, it was suspected that he wrought them perhaps, not in virtue of his professing to come from God, but by means of his Egyptian knowledge, in which he was well versed. For the king, entertaining such a suspicion, summoned the Egyptian magicians, and wise men, and enchanters, who were found to be of no avail as against the wisdom of Moses, which proved superior to all the wisdom of the Egyptians.

Chapter XLVII.

But it is probable that what is written by Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians,[3] as being addressed to Greeks who prided themselves greatly on their Grecian wisdom, has moved some to believe that it was not the object of the gospel to win wise men. Now, let him who is of this opinion understand that the gospel, as censuring wicked men, says of them that they are wise not in things which relate to the understanding, and which are unseen and eternal; but that in busying themselves about things of sense alone, and regarding these as all-important, they are wise men of the world: for as there are in existence a multitude of opinions, some of them espousing the cause of matter and bodies,[4] and asserting that everything is corporeal which has a substantial existence,[5] and that besides these nothing else exists, whether it be called invisible or incorporeal, it says also that these constitute the wisdom of the world, which perishes and fades away, and belongs only to this age, while those opinions which raise the soul from things here to the blessedness which is with God, and to His kingdom, and which teach men to despise all sensible and visible things as existing only

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 8. [2] Acts vii. 22. [3] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 18, etc.

[4] τὰ μὲν συναγορεύοντα ὑλῇ καὶ σώμασι. [5] τὰ προηγουμένως ὑφεστηκότα.

for a season, and to hasten on to things invisible, and to have regard to those things which are not seen,—these, it says, constitute the wisdom of God. But Paul, as a lover of truth, says of certain wise men among the Greeks, when their statements are true, that "although they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful."[1] And he bears witness that they knew God, and says, too, that this did not happen to them without divine permission, in these words: "For God showed it unto them;"[2] dimly alluding, I think, to those who ascend from things of sense to those of the understanding, when he adds, "For the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful."[3]

Chapter xlviii.

And perhaps also from the words, "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and the base things, and the things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh may glory in His presence;"[4] some have been led to suppose that no one who is instructed, or wise, or prudent, embraces the gospel. Now, in answer to such an one, we would say that it has not been stated that "*no* wise man according to the flesh," but that "not *many* wise men according to the flesh," are called. It is manifest, further, that amongst the characteristic qualifications of those who are termed "bishops," Paul, in describing what kind of man the bishop ought to be, lays down as a qualification that he should also be a teacher, saying that he ought to be able to convince the gainsayers, that by the wisdom which is in him he may stop the mouths of foolish talkers and deceivers.[5] And as he selects for the episcopate a man who has been once married[6] rather than he who has twice entered the

[1] Cf. Rom. i. 21. [2] Rom. i. 19. [3] Cf. Rom. i. 20-22.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 26–28. [5] Cf. Tit. i. 9, 10.
[6] Μονόγαμον. Cf. *Can. Apost.* c. xvii.: "ὁ δυσὶ γάμοις συμπλακεὶς μετὰ

married state, and a man of blameless life rather than one who is liable to censure, and a sober man rather than one who is not such, and a prudent man rather than one who is not prudent, and a man whose behaviour is decorous rather than he who is open to the charge even of the slightest indecorum, so he desires that he who is to be chosen by preference for the office of a bishop should be apt to teach, and able to convince the gainsayers. How then can Celsus justly charge us with saying, "Let no one come to us who is 'instructed,' or 'wise,' or 'prudent?'" Nay, let him who wills come to us "instructed," and "wise," and "prudent;" and none the less, if any one be ignorant and unintelligent, and uninstructed and foolish, let him also come: for it is these whom the gospel promises to cure, when they come, by rendering them all worthy of God.

Chapter xlix.

This statement also is untrue, that it is "only foolish and low individuals, and persons devoid of perception, and slaves, and women, and children, of whom the teachers of the divine word wish to make converts." Such indeed does the gospel invite, in order to make them better; but it invites also others who are very different from these, since Christ is the Saviour of all men, and especially of them that believe, whether they be intelligent or simple; and "He is the propitiation with the Father for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."[1] After this it is superfluous for us to wish to offer a reply to such statements of Celsus as the following: "For why is it an evil to have been educated, and to have studied the best opinions, and to have both the reality and appearance of wisdom? What hindrance does this offer to the knowledge of God? Why should it not rather be an assistance, and a means by which one might be better able to arrive at the truth?" Truly it is no evil to have been educated, for education is the way to virtue; but to rank those amongst the number of the educated who hold erroneous opinions is

τὸ βάπτισμα, ἢ παλλακὴν κτησάμενος, οὐ δύναται εἶναι ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ." Cf. note in Benedictine ed.

[1] Cf. 1 John ii. 2.

what even the wise men among the Greeks would not do. On the other hand, who would not admit that to have studied the best opinions is a blessing? But what shall we call the best, save those which are true, and which incite men to virtue? Moreover, it is an excellent thing for a man to *be* wise, but not to *seem* so, as Celsus says. And it is no hindrance to the knowledge of God, but an assistance, to have been educated, and to have studied the best opinions, and to be wise. And it becomes us rather than Celsus to say this, especially if it be shown that he is an Epicurean.

Chapter L.

But let us see what those statements of his are which follow next in these words: "Nay, we see, indeed, that even those individuals, who in the market-places perform the most disgraceful tricks, and who gather crowds around them, would never approach an assembly of wise men, nor dare to exhibit their arts among them; but wherever they see young men, and a mob of slaves, and a gathering of unintelligent persons, thither they thrust themselves in, and show themselves off." Observe, now, how he slanders us in these words, comparing us to those who in the market-places perform the most disreputable tricks, and gather crowds around them! What disreputable tricks, pray, do we perform? Or what is there in *our* conduct that resembles theirs, seeing that by means of readings, and explanations of the things read, we lead men to the worship of the God of the universe, and to the cognate virtues, and turn them away from contemning Deity, and from all things contrary to right reason? Philosophers verily would wish to collect together such hearers of their discourses as exhort men to virtue,—a practice which certain of the Cynics especially have followed, who converse publicly with those whom they happen to meet. Will they maintain, then, that these who do not gather together persons who are considered to have been educated, but who invite and assemble hearers from the public street, resemble those who in the market-places perform the most disreputable tricks, and gather crowds around them? Neither Celsus, however, nor any one who holds the same opinions, will blame those who, agreeably to what they regard as a feel-

ing of philanthropy, address their arguments to the ignorant populace.

Chapter LI.

And if they are not to be blamed for so doing, let us see whether Christians do not exhort multitudes to the practice of virtue in a greater and better degree than they. For the philosophers who converse in public do not pick and choose their hearers, but he who likes stands and listens. The Christians, however, having previously, so far as possible, tested the souls of those who wish to become their hearers, and having previously instructed[1] them in private, when they appear (before entering the community) to have sufficiently evinced their desire towards a virtuous life, introduce them then, and not before, privately forming one class of those who are beginners, and are receiving admission, but who have not yet obtained the mark of complete purification; and another of those who have manifested to the best of their ability their intention to desire no other things than are approved by Christians; and among these there are certain persons appointed to make inquiries regarding the lives and behaviour of those who join them, in order that they may prevent those who commit acts of infamy from coming into their public assembly, while those of a different character they receive with their whole heart, in order that they may daily make them better. And this is their method of procedure, both with those who are sinners, and especially with those who lead dissolute lives, whom they exclude from their community, although, according to Celsus, they resemble those who in the market-places perform the most shameful tricks. Now the venerable school of the Pythagoreans used to erect a cenotaph to those who had apostatized from their system of philosophy, treating them as dead; but the Christians lament as dead those who have been vanquished by licentiousness or any other sin, because they are lost and dead to God, and as being risen from the dead (if they manifest a becoming change) they receive them afterwards, at some future time, after a greater interval than in the case of those who were admitted at first, but not placing

[1] προεπάσαντες.

in any office or post of rank in the church of God those who, after professing the gospel, lapsed and fell.

Chapter LII.

Observe now with regard to the following statement of Celsus, "We see also those persons who in the market-places perform most disreputable tricks, and collect crowds around them," whether a manifest falsehood has not been uttered, and things compared which have no resemblance. He says that these individuals, to whom he compares us, who "perform the most disreputable tricks in the market-places and collect crowds, would never approach an assembly of wise men, nor dare to show off their tricks before them; but wherever they see young men, and a mob of slaves, and a gathering of foolish people, thither do they thrust themselves in and make a display." Now, in speaking thus he does nothing else than simply load us with abuse, like the women upon the public streets, whose object is to slander one another; for we do everything in our power to secure that our meetings should be composed of wise men, and those things among us which are especially excellent and divine we then venture to bring forward publicly in our discussions when we have an abundance of intelligent hearers, while we conceal and pass by in silence the truths of deeper import when we see that our audience is composed of simpler minds, which need such instruction as is figuratively termed "milk."

Chapter LIII.

For the word is used by our Paul in writing to the Corinthians, who were Greeks, and not yet purified in their morals: "I have fed you with milk, not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able, for ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" Now the same writer, knowing that there was a certain kind of nourishment better adapted for the soul, and that the food of those young[1] persons who were admitted was compared to milk, continues: "And ye are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the

[1] νηπίων.

word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."[1] Would then those who believe these words to be well spoken, suppose that the noble doctrines of our faith would never be mentioned in an assembly of wise men, but that wherever [our instructors] see young men, and a mob of slaves, and a collection of foolish individuals, they bring publicly forward divine and venerable truths, and before such persons make a display of themselves in treating of them? But it is clear to him who examines the whole spirit of our writings, that Celsus is animated with a hatred against the human race resembling that of the ignorant populace, and gives utterance to these falsehoods without examination.

Chapter liv.

We acknowledge, however, although Celsus will not have it so, that we *do* desire to instruct all men in the word of God, so as to give to young men the exhortations which are appropriate to them, and to show to slaves how they may recover freedom of thought,[2] and be ennobled by the word. And those amongst us who are the ambassadors of Christianity sufficiently declare that they are debtors[3] to Greeks and barbarians, to wise men and fools, (for they do not deny their obligation to cure the souls even of foolish persons,) in order that as far as possible they may lay aside their ignorance, and endeavour to obtain greater prudence, by listening also to the words of Solomon: "Oh, ye fools, be of an understanding heart,"[4] and "Who is the most simple among you, let him turn unto me;"[5] and wisdom exhorts those who are devoid of understanding in the words, "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mixed for you. Forsake folly that ye may live, and correct understanding in knowledge."[6] This too would I say (seeing it bears on the point),[7] in answer to the statement of Celsus: Do not philosophers invite young men to their lectures? and do they not encourage young men to exchange a wicked

[1] Heb. v. 12–14.
[2] ἐλεύθερον ἀναλαβόντες φρόνημα.
[3] Cf. Rom. i. 14.
[4] Cf. Prov. viii. 5.
[5] Cf. Prov. ix. 4.
[6] Cf. Prov. ix. 5, 6.
[7] διὰ τὰ ἐγκείμενα.

life for a better? and do they not desire slaves to learn philosophy? Must we find fault, then, with philosophers who have exhorted slaves to the practice of virtue? with Pythagoras for having so done with Zamolxis, Zeno with Perseus, and with those who recently encouraged Epictetus to the study of philosophy? Is it indeed permissible for you, O Greeks, to call youths and slaves and foolish persons to the study of philosophy, but if *we* do so, we do not act from philanthropic motives in wishing to heal every rational nature with the medicine of reason, and to bring them into fellowship with God, the Creator of all things? These remarks, then, may suffice in answer to what are slanders rather than accusations[1] on the part of Celsus.

Chapter lv.

But as Celsus delights to heap up calumnies against us, and, in addition to those which he has already uttered, has added others, let us examine these also, and see whether it be the Christians or Celsus who have reason to be ashamed of what is said. He asserts, "We see, indeed, in private houses workers in wool and leather, and fullers, and persons of the most uninstructed and rustic character, not venturing to utter a word in the presence of their elders and wiser masters;[2] but when they get hold of the children privately, and certain women as ignorant as themselves, they pour forth wonderful statements, to the effect that they ought not to give heed to their father and to their teachers, but should obey them; that the former are foolish and stupid, and neither know nor can perform anything that is really good, being preoccupied with empty trifles; that *they* alone know how men ought to live, and that, if the children obey them, they will both be happy themselves, and will make their home happy also. And while thus speaking, if they see one of the instructors of youth

[1] λοιδορίας μᾶλλον ἢ κατηγορίας.

[2] The allusion is to the practice of wealthy Greeks and Romans having among their slaves artificers of various kinds, for whose service there was constant demand in the houses and villas of the rich, and who therefore had their residence in or near the dwelling of their master. Many of these artificers seem, from the language of Celsus, to have been converts to Christianity.

approaching, or one of the more intelligent class, or even the father himself, the more timid among them become afraid, while the more forward incite the children to throw off the yoke, whispering that in the presence of father and teachers they neither will nor can explain to them any good thing, seeing they turn away with aversion from the silliness and stupidity of such persons as being altogether corrupt, and far advanced in wickedness, and such as would inflict punishment upon them; but that if they wish [to avail themselves of their aid,] they must leave their father and their instructors, and go with the women and their playfellows to the women's apartments, or to the leather shop, or to the fuller's shop, that they may attain to perfection;—and by words like these they gain them over."

Chapter LVI.

Observe now how by such statements he depreciates those amongst us who are teachers of the word, and who strive in every way to raise the soul to the Creator of all things, and who show that we ought to despise things "sensible," and "temporal," and "visible," and to do our utmost to reach communion with God, and the contemplation of things that are "intelligent," and "invisible," and a blessed life with God, and the friends of God; comparing them to "workers in wool in private houses, and to leather-cutters, and to fullers, and to the most rustic of mankind, who carefully incite young boys to wickedness, and women to forsake their fathers and teachers, and follow them." Now let Celsus point out from what wise parent, or from what teachers, we keep away children and women, and let him ascertain by comparison among those children and women who are adherents of our doctrine, whether any of the opinions which they formerly heard are better than ours, and in what manner we draw away children and women from noble and venerable studies, and incite them to worse things. But he will not be able to make good any such charge against us, seeing that, on the contrary, we turn away women from a dissolute life, and from being at variance with those with whom they live, from all mad desires after theatres and dancing, and from superstition; while we train to habits of self-

restraint boys just reaching the age of puberty, and feeling a desire for sexual pleasures, pointing out to them not only the disgrace which attends those sins, but also the state to which the soul of the wicked is reduced through practices of that kind, and the judgments which it will suffer, and the punishments which will be inflicted.

Chapter LVII.

But who are the teachers whom we call triflers and fools, whose defence is undertaken by Celsus, as of those who teach better things? [I know not,] unless he deem those to be good instructors of women, and no triflers, who invite them to superstition and to unchaste spectacles, and those, moreover, to be teachers not devoid of sense who lead young men to the communion of all those disorderly acts which we know are often committed by them. We indeed call away these also, as far as we can, from the dogmas of philosophy to our worship of God, by showing forth its excellence and purity. But as Celsus, by his statements, has declared that we do not do so, but that we call only the foolish, I would say to him, "If you had charged us with withdrawing from the study of philosophy those who were already preoccupied with it, you would not have spoken the truth, and yet your charge would have had an appearance of probability; but when you now say that we draw away our adherents from good teachers, show who are those other teachers save the teachers of philosophy, or those who have been appointed to give instruction in some useful branch of study." [1]

He will be unable, however, to show any such; while we promise, openly and not in secret, that *they* will be happy who live according to the word of God, and who look to Him in all things, and who do everything, whatever it is, as if in the presence of God. Are these the instructions of workers in wool, and of leather-cutters, and fullers, and uneducated rustics? But such an assertion he cannot make good.

Chapter LVIII.

But those who, in the opinion of Celsus, resemble the

[1] Παράστησον τοὺς διδασκάλους ἄλλους παρὰ τοὺς φιλοσοφίας διδασκάλους, ἢ τοὺς κατὰ τὶ τῶν χρησίμων πεποιημένους.

workers in wool in private houses, and the leather-cutters, and fullers, and uneducated rustics, will, he alleges, in the presence of father or teachers be unwilling to speak, or unable to explain to the boys anything that is good. In answer to which, we would say, What kind of father, my good sir, and what kind of teacher, do you mean? If you mean one who approves of virtue, and turns away from vice, and welcomes what is better, then know, that with the greatest boldness will we declare our opinions to the children, because we will be in good repute with such a judge. But if, in the presence of a father who has a hatred of virtue and goodness, we keep silence, and also before those who teach what is contrary to sound doctrine, do not blame us for so doing, since you will blame us without good reason. You, at all events, in a case where fathers deemed the mysteries of philosophy an idle and unprofitable occupation for their sons, and for young men in general, would not, in teaching philosophy, make known its secrets before worthless parents; but, desiring to keep apart those sons of wicked parents who had been turned towards the study of philosophy, you would observe the proper seasons, in order that the doctrines of philosophy might reach the minds of the young men. And we say the same regarding our teachers. For if we turn [our hearers] away from those instructors who teach obscene comedies and licentious iambics, and many other things which neither improve the speaker nor benefit the hearers (because the latter do not know how to listen to poetry in a philosophic frame of mind, nor the former how to say to each of the young men what tends to his profit), we are not, in following such a course, ashamed to confess what we do. But if you will show me teachers who train young men for philosophy, and who exercise them in it, I will not from such turn away young men, but will try to raise them, as those who have been previously exercised in the whole circle of learning and in philosophical subjects, to the venerable and lofty height of eloquence which lies hid from the multitude of Christians, where are discussed topics of the greatest importance, and where it is demonstrated and shown that they have been treated philosophically both by the prophets of God and the apostles of Jesus.

Chapter LIX.

Immediately after this, Celsus, perceiving that he has slandered us with too great bitterness, as if by way of defence expresses himself as follows: "That I bring no heavier charge than what the truth compels me, any one may see from the following remarks. Those who invite to participation in other mysteries, make proclamation as follows: 'Every one who has clean hands, and a prudent tongue;'[1] others again thus: 'He who is pure from all pollution, and whose soul is conscious of no evil, and who has lived well and justly.' Such is the proclamation made by those who promise purification from sins. But let us hear what kind of persons these Christians invite. Every one, they say, who is a sinner, who is devoid of understanding, who is a child, and, to speak generally, whoever is unfortunate, him will the kingdom of God receive. Do you not call him a sinner, then, who is unjust, and a thief, and a housebreaker, and a poisoner, and a committer of sacrilege, and a robber of the dead? What others would a man invite if he were issuing a proclamation for an assembly of robbers?" Now, in answer to such statements, we say that it is not the same thing to invite those who are *sick in soul* to be *cured*, and those who are *in health* to the *knowledge* and *study* of divine things. We, however, keeping both these things in view, at first invite all men to be healed, and exhort those who are sinners to come to the consideration of the doctrines which teach men not to sin, and those who are devoid of understanding to those which beget wisdom, and those who are children to rise in their thoughts to manhood, and those who are simply[2] unfortunate to good fortune,[3] or—which is the more appropriate term to use—to blessedness.[4] And when those who have been turned towards virtue have made progress, and have shown that they have been purified by the word, and have led as far as they can a better life, then and not before do we invite them to participation in our mysteries. "For we speak wisdom among them that are perfect."[5]

[1] *φωνὴν συνετός.* [2] *ἁπλῶς.* [3] *εὐδαιμονίαν.*
[4] *μακαριότητα.* [5] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 6.

Chapter LX.

And as we teach, moreover, that "wisdom will not enter into the soul of a base man, nor dwell in a body that is involved in sin,"[1] we say, Whoever has clean hands, and therefore lifts up holy hands to God, and by reason of being occupied with elevated and heavenly things, can say, "The lifting up of my hands is as the evening sacrifice,"[2] let him come to us; and whoever has a wise tongue through meditating on the law of the Lord day and night, and by "reason of habit has his senses exercised to discern between good and evil," let him have no reluctance in coming to the strong and rational sustenance which is adapted to those who are athletes in piety and every virtue. And since the grace of God is with all those who love with a pure affection the teacher of the doctrines of immortality, whoever is pure not only from all defilement, but from what are regarded as lesser transgressions, let him be boldly initiated in the mysteries of Jesus, which properly are made known only to the holy and the pure. The initiated of Celsus accordingly says, "Let him whose soul is conscious of no evil come." But he who acts as initiator, according to the precepts of Jesus, will say to those who have been purified in heart, "He whose soul has, for a long time, been conscious of no evil, and especially since he yielded himself to the healing of the word, let such an one hear the doctrines which were spoken in private by Jesus to His genuine disciples." Therefore in the comparison which he institutes between the procedure of the initiators into the Grecian mysteries, and the teachers of the doctrine of Jesus, he does not know the difference between inviting the wicked to be healed, and initiating those already purified into the sacred mysteries!

Chapter LXI.

Not to *participation in mysteries*, then, and to *fellowship in the wisdom hidden in a mystery*, which God ordained before the world to the glory of His saints,[3] do we invite the *wicked* man, and the *thief*, and the *housebreaker*, and the *poisoner*, and the *committer of sacrilege*, and the *plunderer of the dead*, and all

[1] Wisd. Solom. i. 4. [2] Cf. Ps. cxli. 2. [3] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7.

those others whom Celsus may enumerate in his exaggerating style, but such as these we invite to be *healed.* For there are in the divinity of the word some helps towards the cure of those who are sick, respecting which the word says, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick;"[1] others, again, which to the pure in soul and body exhibit "the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest by the Scriptures of the prophets,"[2] and "by the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[3] which "appearing" is manifested to each one of those who are perfect, and which enlightens the reason[4] in the true[5] knowledge of things. But as he exaggerates the charges against us, adding, after his list of those vile individuals whom he has mentioned, this remark, "What other persons would a robber summon to himself by proclamation?" we answer such a question by saying that a robber summons around him individuals of such a character, in order to make use of their villany against the men whom they desire to slay and plunder. A Christian, on the other hand, even though he invite those whom the robber invites, invites them to a very different vocation, viz. to bind up these wounds by His word, and to apply to the soul, festering amid evils, the drugs obtained from the word, and which are analogous to the wine and oil, and plasters, and other healing appliances which belong to the art of medicine.

Chapter LXII.

In the next place, throwing a slur[6] upon the exhortations spoken and written to those who have led wicked lives, and which invite them to repentance and reformation of heart, he asserts that we say "that it was to sinners that God has been sent." Now this statement of his is much the same as if he were to find fault with certain persons for saying that on account of the sick who were living in a city, a physician had been sent them by a very benevolent monarch. God the Word was sent, indeed, as a physician to sinners, but as a teacher of divine mysteries to those who are already pure and who sin no more. But Celsus, unable to see this distinction,—for he had no

[1] Matt. ix. 12. [2] Rom. xvi. 25, 26. [3] Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 10.
[4] τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. [5] ἀψευδῆ. [6] συκοφαντῶν.

desire to be animated with a love of truth,—remarks, "Why was he not sent to those who were without sin? What evil is it not to have committed sin?" To which we reply, that if by those "who were without sin" he means those who sin no more, then our Saviour Jesus was sent even to such, but not as a physician. While if by those "who were without sin" he means such as have never at any time sinned,—for he made no distinction in his statement,—we reply that it is impossible for a man thus to be without sin. And this we say, excepting, of course, the man understood to be in Christ Jesus,[1] who "did no sin." It is with a malicious intent, indeed, that Celsus says of us that we assert that "God will receive the unrighteous man if he humble himself on account of his wickedness, but that He will not receive the righteous man, although he look up to Him, [adorned] with virtue from the beginning." Now we assert that it is impossible for a man to look up to God [adorned] with virtue from the beginning. For wickedness must necessarily first exist in men. As Paul also says, "When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died."[2] Moreover, we do not teach regarding the unrighteous man, that it is sufficient for him to humble himself on account of his wickedness in order to his being accepted by God, but that God will accept him if, after passing condemnation upon himself for his past conduct, he walk humbly on account of it, and in a becoming manner for the time to come.

Chapter LXIII.

After this, not understanding how it has been said that "every one who exalteth himself shall be abased;"[3] nor (although taught even by Plato) that "the good and virtuous man walketh humbly and orderly;" and ignorant, moreover, that we give the injunction, "Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time;"[4] he says that "those persons who preside properly over a trial make those individuals who bewail before them their evil deeds to cease from their piteous wailings, lest their decisions should be determined rather by compassion than by a regard to truth;

[1] *ὑπεξαιρομένου τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ζησοῦν νοουμένου ἀνθρώπου.*
[2] Rom. vii. 9. [3] Cf. Matt. xxiii. 12. [4] 1 Pet. v. 6.

whereas God does not decide in accordance with truth, but in accordance with flattery."[1] Now, what words of flattery and piteous wailing are contained in the Holy Scriptures when the sinner says in his prayers to God, "I have acknowledged my sin, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgression to the Lord," etc. etc.? For is he able to show that a procedure of this kind is not adapted to the conversion of sinners, who humble themselves in their prayers under the hand of God? And, becoming confused by his effort to accuse us, he contradicts himself; appearing at one time to know a man "without sin," and "a righteous man, who can look up to God [adorned] with virtue from the beginning;" and at another time accepting our statement that there is no man altogether righteous, or without sin;[2] for, as if he admitted its truth, he remarks, "This is indeed apparently true, that somehow the human race is naturally inclined to sin." In the next place, as if all men were not invited by the word, he says, "All men, then, without distinction, ought to be invited, since all indeed are sinners." And yet, in the preceding pages, we have pointed out the words of Jesus: "Come unto me, *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."[3] *All* men, therefore, labouring and being heavy laden on account of the nature of sin, are invited to the rest spoken of in the word of God, "for God sent His word, and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions."[4]

Chapter lxiv.

But since he says, in addition to this, "What is this preference of sinners over others?" and makes other remarks of a similar nature, we have to reply that absolutely a sinner is not preferred before one who is not a sinner; but that sometimes a sinner, who has become conscious of his own sin, and for that reason comes to repentance, being humbled on account of his sins, is preferred before one

[1] πρὸς κολακείαν.

[2] In the text it is put interrogatively: τίς ἄνθρωπος τελέως δίκαιος; ἢ τίς ἀναμάρτητος; The allusion seems to be to Job xv. 14: τίς γὰρ ἂν βροτὸς, ὅτι ἔσται ἄμεμπτος; ἢ ὡς ἐσόμενος δίκαιος γεννητὸς γυναικός.

[3] Matt. xi. 28.

[4] Ps. cvii. 20.

who is accounted a lesser sinner, but who does not consider himself one, but exalts himself on the ground of certain good qualities which he thinks he possesses, and is greatly elated on their account. And this is manifest to those who are willing to peruse the Gospels in a spirit of fairness, by the parable of the publican, who said, "Be merciful to me a sinner,"[1] and of the Pharisee who boasted with a certain wicked self-conceit in the words, "I thank Thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican."[2] For Jesus subjoins to His narrative of them both the words: "This man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."[3] We utter no blasphemy, then, against God, neither are we guilty of falsehood, when we teach that every man, whoever he may be, is conscious of human infirmity in comparison with the greatness of God, and that we must ever ask from Him, who alone is able to supply our deficiencies, what is wanting to our [mortal] nature.

Chapter LXV.

He imagines, however, that we utter these exhortations for the conversion of sinners, because we are able to gain over no one who is really good and righteous, and therefore open our gates to the most unholy and abandoned of men. But if any one will fairly observe our assemblies, we can present a greater number of those who have been converted from not a very wicked life, than of those who have committed the most abominable sins. For naturally those who are conscious to themselves of better things, desire that those promises may be true which are declared by God regarding the reward of the righteous, and thus assent more readily to the statements [of Scripture] than those do who have led very wicked lives, and who are prevented by their very consciousness [of evil] from admitting that they will be punished by the Judge of all with such punishment as befits those who have sinned so greatly, and as would not be inflicted by the Judge of all contrary to right reason.[4] Sometimes, also, when very abandoned men are willing

[1] Luke xviii. 13. [2] Luke xviii. 11. [3] Luke xviii. 14.

[4] καὶ οὐ παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον προσάγοιτο ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι δικαστοῦ.

to accept the doctrine of [future] punishment, on account of the hope which is based upon repentance, they are prevented from so doing by their habit of sinning, being constantly dipped, and, as it were, dyed in wickedness, and possessing no longer the power to turn from it easily to a proper life, and one regulated according to right reason. And although Celsus observes this, he nevertheless, I know not why, expresses himself in the following terms: "And yet, indeed, it is manifest to every one that no one by chastisement, much less by merciful treatment, could effect a complete change in those who are sinners both by nature and custom, for to change nature is an exceedingly difficult thing. But they who are without sin are partakers of a better life."

Chapter LXVI.

Now here Celsus appears to me to have committed a great error, in refusing to those who are sinners by nature, and also by habit, the possibility of a complete transformation, alleging that they cannot be cured even by punishment. For it clearly appears that all men are inclined to sin by nature, and some not only by nature but by practice, while not all men are incapable of an entire transformation. For there are found in every philosophical sect, and in the word of God, persons who are related to have undergone so great a change that they may be proposed as a model of excellence of life. Among the names of the heroic age some mention Hercules and Ulysses, among those of later times, Socrates, and of those who have lived very recently, Musonius.[1] Not only against us, then, did Celsus utter the calumny, when he said that "it was manifest to every one that those who were given to sin by nature and habit could not by any means—even by punishments—be completely changed for the better," but also against the noblest names in philosophy, who have not denied that the recovery of virtue was a possible thing for men. But although he did not express his meaning with exactness, we shall nevertheless, though giving his words a more favourable construction, convict him of unsound reasoning. For his words were: "Those who are inclined to

[1] He is said to have been either a Babylonian or Tyrrhenian, and to have lived in the reign of Nero. Cf. Philostratus, iv. 12.—Ruæus.

sin by nature and habit, no one could completely reform even by chastisement;" and his words, as we understood them, we refuted to the best of our ability.[1]

Chapter LXVII.

It is probable, however, that he meant to convey some such meaning as this, that those who were both by nature and habit given to the commission of those sins which are committed by the most abandoned of men, could not be completely transformed even by punishment. And yet this is shown to be false from the history of certain philosophers. For who is there that would not rank among the most abandoned of men the individual who somehow submitted to yield himself to his master, when he placed him in a brothel,[2] that he might allow himself to be polluted by any one who liked? And yet such a circumstance is related of Phædo! And who will not agree that he who burst, accompanied with a flute-player and a party of revellers, his profligate associates, into the school of the venerable Xenocrates, to insult a man who was the admiration of his friends, was not one of the greatest miscreants[3] among mankind? Yet, notwithstanding this, reason was powerful enough to effect their conversion, and to enable them to make such progress in philosophy, that the one was deemed worthy by Plato to recount the discourse of Socrates on immortality, and to record his firmness in prison, when he evinced his contempt of the hemlock, and with all fearlessness and tranquillity of mind treated of subjects so numerous and important, that it is difficult even for those to follow them who are giving their utmost attention, and who are disturbed by no distraction; while Polemon, on the other hand, who from a profligate became a man of most temperate life, was successor in the school of Xenocrates, so celebrated for his venerable character. Celsus then does not speak the truth when he says "that sinners by nature and habit cannot be completely reformed even by chastisement."

Chapter LXVIII.

That philosophical discourses, however, distinguished by

[1] καὶ τὸ ἐξακουόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως, ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν, ἀνετρέψαμεν.
[2] ἐπὶ τέγους. [3] μιαρώτατον ἀνθρώπων.

orderly arrangement and elegant expression,[1] should produce such results in the case of those individuals just enumerated, and upon others[2] who have led wicked lives, is not at all to be wondered at. But when we consider that those discourses, which Celsus terms "vulgar,"[3] are filled with power, as if they were spells, and see that they at once convert multitudes from a life of licentiousness to one of extreme regularity,[4] and from a life of wickedness to a better, and from a state of cowardice or unmanliness to one of such high-toned courage as to lead men to despise even death through the piety which shows itself within them, why should we not justly admire the power which they contain? For the words of those who at the first assumed the office of [Christian] ambassadors, and who gave their labours to rear up the churches of God,—nay, their preaching also,—were accompanied with a persuasive power, though not like that found among those who profess the philosophy of Plato, or of any other merely human philosopher, which possesses no other qualities than those of human nature. But the demonstration which followed the words of the apostles of Jesus was given from God, and was accredited[5] by the Spirit and by power. And therefore *their* word ran swiftly and speedily, or rather the word of *God* through their instrumentality, transformed numbers of persons who had been sinners both by nature and habit, whom no one could have reformed by punishment, but who were changed by the word, which moulded and transformed them according to its pleasure.

Chapter LXIX.

Celsus continues in his usual manner, asserting that "to change a nature entirely is exceedingly difficult." We, however, who know of only one nature in every rational soul, and who maintain that none has been created evil by the Author of all things, but that many have *become* wicked through education, and perverse example, and surrounding influences,[6] so

[1] Ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν τάξιν καὶ σύνθεσιν καὶ φράσιν τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας λόγων.

[2] The reading in the text is ἄλλως, for which ἄλλους has been conjectured by Ruæus and Boherellus, and which has been adopted in the translation.

[3] ἰδιωτικούς. [4] εὐσταθέστατον. [5] πιστικὴ ἀπὸ πνεύματος.

[6] παρὰ τὰς ἀνατροφὰς, καὶ τὰς διαστροφὰς, καὶ τὰς περιηχήσεις.

that wickedness has been naturalized[1] in some individuals, are persuaded that for the word of God to change a nature in which evil has been naturalized is not only not impossible, but is even a work of no very great difficulty, if a man only believe that he must entrust himself to the God of all things, and do everything with a view to please Him with whom

> "Both good and bad are not in the same honour,
> Nor do the idle man and he who has laboured much
> Perish alike."[2]

But even if it be exceedingly difficult to effect a change in some persons, the cause must be held to lie in their own will, which is reluctant to accept the belief that the God over all things is a just Judge of all the deeds done during life. For deliberate choice and practice[3] avail much towards the accomplishment of things which appear to be very difficult, and, to speak hyperbolically, almost impossible. Has the nature of man, when desiring to walk along a rope extended in the air through the middle of the theatre, and to carry at the same time numerous and heavy weights, been able by practice and attention to accomplish such a feat; but when desiring to live in conformity with the practice of virtue, does it find it impossible to do so, although formerly it may have been exceedingly wicked? See whether he who holds such views does not bring a charge against the nature of the Creator of the rational animal[4] rather than against the creature, if He has formed the nature of man with powers for the attainment of things of such difficulty, and of no utility whatever, but has rendered it incapable of securing its own blessedness. But these remarks may suffice as an answer to the assertion that "entirely to change a nature is exceedingly difficult." He alleges, in the next place, that "they who are without sin are partakers of a better life;" not making it clear what he means by "those who are without sin," whether those who are so from the beginning [of their lives], or those who become so by a transformation. Of those who were so from the beginning of their lives, there cannot possibly be any; while those who are so after a transformation [of heart] are found to be few in number, being those who

[1] φυσιωθῆναι.
[2] Cf. *Iliad*, ix. 319, 320.
[3] προαίρεσις καὶ ἄσκησις.
[4] τοῦ λογικοῦ ζώου.

have become so after giving in their allegiance to the saving word. And they were not such when they gave in their allegiance. For, apart from the aid of the word, and that too the word of perfection, it is impossible for a man to become free from sin.

Chapter LXX.

In the next place, he objects to the statement, as if it were maintained by us, that "God will be able to do all things," not seeing even here how these words are meant, and what "the *all things*" are which are included in it, and how it is said that God "will be able." But on these matters it is not necessary now to speak; for although he might with a show of reason have opposed this proposition, he has not done so. Perhaps he did not understand the arguments which might be plausibly used against it, or if he did, he saw the answers that might be returned. Now in our judgment God can do everything which it is possible for Him to do without ceasing to be God, and good, and wise. But Celsus asserts—not comprehending the meaning of the expression "God can do all things"—"that He will not desire to do anything wicked," admitting that He has the *power*, but not the *will*, to commit evil. We, on the contrary, maintain that as that which by nature possesses the property of sweetening other things through its own inherent sweetness cannot produce bitterness contrary to its own peculiar nature,[1] nor that whose nature it is to produce light through its being light can cause darkness; so neither is God able to commit wickedness, for the power of doing evil is contrary to His deity and its omnipotence. Whereas if any one among existing things is able to commit wickedness from being inclined to wickedness by nature, it does so from not having in its nature the ability not to do evil.

Chapter LXXI.

He next assumes what is not granted by the more rational class of believers, but what perhaps is considered to be true by some who are devoid of intelligence,—viz. that "God, like

[1] ὥσπερ οὐ δύναται τὸ πεφυκὸς γλυκαίνειν τῷ γλυκὺ τυγχάνειν πικράζειν, παρὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ μόνην αἰτίαν.

those who are overcome with pity, being Himself overcome, alleviates the sufferings of the wicked through pity for their wailings, and casts off the good, who do nothing of that kind, which is the height of injustice." Now, in our judgment, God lightens the suffering of no wicked man who has not betaken himself to a virtuous life, and casts off no one who is already good, nor yet alleviates the suffering of any one who mourns, simply because he utters lamentation, or takes pity upon him, to use the word pity in its more common acceptation.[1] But those who have passed severe condemnation upon themselves because of their sins, and who, as on that account, lament and bewail themselves as lost, so far as their previous conduct is concerned, and who have manifested a satisfactory change, are received by God on account of their repentance, as those who have undergone a transformation from a life of great wickedness. For virtue, taking up her abode in the souls of these persons, and expelling the wickedness which had previous possession of them, produces an oblivion of the past. And even although virtue do not effect an entrance, yet if a considerable progress take place in the soul, even that is sufficient, in the proportion that it is progressive, to drive out and destroy the flood of wickedness, so that it almost ceases to remain in the soul.

Chapter LXXII.

In the next place, speaking as in the person of a teacher of our doctrine, he expresses himself as follows: "Wise men reject what we say, being led into error, and ensnared by their wisdom." In reply to which we say that, since wisdom is the knowledge of divine and human things and of their causes, or, as it is defined by the word of God, "the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty, and the brightness of the everlasting light, and the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness,"[2] no one who was really wise would reject what is said by a Christian acquainted with the principles of Christianity, or would be led into error, or ensnared by it. For true wisdom does not mislead, but ignorance does, while of existing things

[1] Ἵνα κοινότερον τῷ ἐλέει χρήσωμαι.

[2] Cf. Wisd. of Solom. vii. 25, 26.

knowledge alone is permanent, and the truth which is derived from wisdom. But if, contrary to the definition of wisdom, you call any one whatever who dogmatizes with sophistical opinions wise, we answer that in conformity with what *you* call wisdom, such an one rejects the words of God, being misled and ensnared by plausible sophisms. And since, according to our doctrine, wisdom is not the knowledge of evil, but the knowledge of evil, so to speak, is in those who hold false opinions and who are deceived by them, I would therefore in such persons term it ignorance rather than wisdom.

Chapter lxxiii.

After this he again slanders the ambassador of Christianity, and gives out regarding him that he relates "ridiculous things," although he does not show or clearly point out what are the things which he calls "ridiculous." And in his slanders he says that "no wise man believes the gospel, being driven away by the multitudes who adhere to it." And in this he acts like one who should say that owing to the multitude of those ignorant persons who are brought into subjection to the laws, no wise man would yield obedience to Solon, for example, or to Lycurgus, or Zaleucus, or any other legislator, and especially if by wise man he means one who is wise [by living] in conformity with virtue. For, as with regard to these ignorant persons, the legislators, according to their ideas of utility, caused them to be surrounded with appropriate guidance and laws, so God, legislating through Jesus Christ for men in all parts of the world, brings to Himself even those who are not wise in the way in which it is possible for such persons to be brought to a better life. And God, well knowing this, as we have already shown in the preceding pages, says in the books of Moses: "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their idols: and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation."[1] And Paul also, knowing this, said, "But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise,"[2] calling, in

[1] Cf. Deut. xxxii. 21. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. 1. 27.

a general way, wise all who appear to have made advances in knowledge, but have fallen into an atheistic polytheism, since "professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."[1]

Chapter LXXIV.

He accuses the Christian teacher, moreover, of "seeking after the unintelligent." In answer, we ask, Whom do you mean by the "unintelligent?" For, to speak accurately, every wicked man is "unintelligent." If then by "unintelligent" you mean the wicked, do you, in drawing men to philosophy, seek to gain the wicked or the virtuous?[2] But it is impossible to gain the virtuous, because they have already given themselves to philosophy. The wicked, then, [you try to gain;] but if they are wicked, are they "unintelligent?" And many such you seek to win over to philosophy, and you therefore seek the "unintelligent." But if I seek after those who are thus termed "unintelligent," I act like a benevolent physician, who should seek after the sick in order to help and cure them. If, however, by "unintelligent" you mean persons who are not clever,[3] but the inferior class of men intellectually,[4] I shall answer that I endeavour to improve such also to the best of my ability, although I would not desire to build up the Christian community out of such materials. For I seek in preference those who are more clever and acute, because they are able to comprehend the meaning of the hard sayings, and of those passages in the law, and prophecies, and Gospels, which are expressed with obscurity, and which you have despised as not containing anything worthy of notice, because you have not ascertained the meaning which they contain, nor tried to enter into the aim of the writers.

[1] Rom. i. 22, 23. [2] ἀστείους. [3] τοὺς μὴ ἐντρεχεῖς.

[4] The reading in the text is τερατωδεστέρους, of which Ruæus remarks, "Hic nullum habet locum." Καταδεεστέρους has been conjectured instead, and has been adopted in the translation.

Chapter LXXV.

But as he afterwards says that "the teacher of Christianity acts like a person who promises to restore patients to bodily health, but who prevents them from consulting skilled physicians, by whom his ignorance would be exposed," we shall inquire in reply, "What are the physicians to whom you refer, from whom we turn away ignorant individuals? For you do not suppose that we exhort those to embrace the gospel who are devoted to philosophy, so that you would regard the latter as the physicians from whom we keep away such as we invite to come to the word of God." He indeed will make no answer, because he cannot name the physicians; or else he will be obliged to betake himself to those of them who are ignorant, and who of their own accord servilely yield themselves to the worship of many gods, and to whatever other opinions are entertained by ignorant individuals. In either case, then, he will be shown to have employed to no purpose in his argument the illustration of "one who keeps others away from skilled physicians." But if, in order to preserve from the philosophy of Epicurus, and from such as are considered physicians after his system, those who are deceived by them, why should we not be acting most reasonably in keeping such away from a dangerous disease caused by the physicians of Celsus,—that, viz., which leads to the annihilation of providence, and the introduction of pleasure as a good? But let it be conceded that we do keep away those whom we encourage to become our disciples from other philosopher-physicians,—from the Peripatetics, for example, who deny the existence of providence and the relation of Deity to man,—why shall we not piously train and heal those who have been thus encouraged, persuading them to devote themselves to the God of all things, and free those who yield obedience to us from the great wounds inflicted by the words of such as are deemed to be philosophers? Nay, let it also be admitted that we turn away from physicians of the sect of the Stoics, who introduce a corruptible god, and assert that his essence consists

[1] For εὐσεβεῖς in the text, Boherellus conjectures εὐσεβῶς.

of a body, which is capable of being changed and altered in all its parts,[1] and who also maintain that all things will one day perish, and that God alone will be left; why shall we not even thus emancipate our subjects from evils, and bring them by pious arguments to devote themselves to the Creator, and to admire the Father of the Christian system, who has so arranged that instruction of the most benevolent kind, and fitted for the conversion of souls,[2] should be distributed throughout the whole human race? Nay, if we should cure those who have fallen into the folly of believing in the transmigration of souls through the teaching of physicians, who will have it that the rational nature descends sometimes into all kinds of irrational animals, and sometimes into that state of being which is incapable of using the imagination,[3] why should we not improve the souls of our subjects by means of a doctrine which does not teach that a state of insensibility or irrationalism is produced in the wicked instead of punishment, but which shows that the labours and chastisements inflicted upon the wicked by God are a kind of medicines leading to conversion? For those who are intelligent Christians,[4] keeping this in view, deal with the simple-minded, as parents do with very young[5] children. We do not betake ourselves then to young persons and silly rustics, saying to them, "Flee from physicians." Nor do we say, "See that none of you lay hold of knowledge;" nor do we assert that "knowledge is an evil;" nor are we mad enough to say that "knowledge causes men to lose their soundness of mind." We would not even say that any one ever perished through wisdom; and although we give

[1] *θεὸν φθαρτὸν εἰσαγόντων, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ λεγόντων σῶμα τρεπτὸν διόλου καὶ ἀλλοιωτὸν, καὶ μεταβλητόν.*

[2] The words in the text are, *φιλανθρωπότατα ἐπιστρεπτικὸν, καὶ ψυχῶν μαθήματα οἰκονομήσαντα*, for which we have adopted in the translation the emendation of Boherellus, *φιλανθρωπότατα καὶ ψυχῶν ἐπιστρεπτικὰ μαθήματα.*

[3] *ἀλλὰ κἂν τοὺς πεπονθότας τὴν περὶ τῆς μετενσωματώσεως ἄνοιαν ἀπὸ ἰατρῶν, τῶν καταβιβαζόντων τὴν λογικὴν φύσιν ὁτὲ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄλογον πᾶσαν, ὁτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀφάνταστον.*

[4] Instead of *οἱ φρονίμως Χριστιανοὶ ζῶντες*, as in the text, Ruæus and Boherellus conjecture *οἱ φρονίμως Χριστιανίζοντες*, etc.

[5] *τοὺς κομιδῇ νηπίους.*

instruction, we never say, "Give heed to me," but "Give heed to the God of all things, and to Jesus, the giver of instruction concerning Him." And none of us is so great a braggart[1] as to say what Celsus put in the mouth of one of our teachers to his acquaintances, "I alone will save you." Observe here the lies which he utters against us! Moreover, we do *not* assert that "true physicians destroy those whom they promise to cure."

Chapter LXXVI.

And he produces a second illustration to our disadvantage, saying that "our teacher acts like a drunken man, who, entering a company of drunkards, should accuse those who are sober of being drunk." But let him show, say from the writings of Paul, that the apostle of Jesus gave way to drunkenness, and that his words were not those of soberness; or from the writings of John, that his thoughts do not breathe a spirit of temperance and of freedom from the intoxication of evil. No one, then, who is of sound mind, and teaches the doctrines of Christianity, gets drunk with wine; but Celsus utters these calumnies against us in a spirit very unlike that of a philosopher. Moreover, let Celsus say who those "sober" persons are whom the ambassadors of Christianity accuse. For in our judgment all are intoxicated who address themselves to inanimate objects as to God. And why do I say "intoxicated?" "Insane" would be the more appropriate word for those who hasten to temples and worship images or animals as divinities. And they too are not less insane who think that images, fashioned by men of worthless and sometimes most wicked character, confer any honour upon genuine divinities.

Chapter LXXVII.

He next likens our teacher to one suffering from ophthalmia, and his disciples to those suffering from the same disease, and says that "such an one amongst a company of those who are afflicted with ophthalmia, accuses those who are sharp-sighted of being blind." Who, then, would we ask, O Greeks, are they who in our judgment do not see, save those who are unable to look up from the exceeding greatness of the world and

[1] ἀλαζών.

its contents, and from the beauty of created things, and to see that they ought to worship, and admire, and reverence Him alone who made these things, and that it is not befitting to treat with reverence anything contrived by man, and applied to the honour of God, whether it be without a reference to the Creator, or with one?[1] For, to compare with that illimitable excellence, which surpasses all created being, things which ought not to be brought into comparison with it, is the act of those whose understanding is darkened. We do not then say that those who are sharp-sighted are suffering from ophthalmia or blindness; but we assert that those who, in ignorance of God, give themselves to temples and images, and so-called sacred seasons,[2] are blinded in their minds, and especially when, in addition to their impiety, they live also in licentiousness, not even inquiring after any honourable work whatever, but doing everything that is of a disgraceful character.

Chapter LXXVIII.

After having brought against us charges of so serious a kind, he wishes to make it appear that, although he has others to adduce, he passes them by in silence. His words are as follow: "These charges I have to bring against them, and others of a similar nature, not to enumerate them one by one, and I affirm that they are in error, and that they act insolently towards God, in order to lead on wicked men by empty hopes, and to persuade them to despise better things, saying that if they refrain from them it will be better for them." In answer to which, it might be said that from the power which shows itself in those who are converted to Christianity, it is not at all the "wicked" who are won over to the gospel, as the more simple class of persons, and, as many would term them, the "unpolished."[3] For such individuals, through fear of the punishments that are threatened, which arouses and exhorts them to refrain from those actions which are followed by punishments, strive to yield themselves up to the Christian religion, being influenced by the

[1] εἴτε χωρὶς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεοῦ εἴτε καὶ μετ' ἐκείνου. [2] ἱερομηνίας.

[3] The reading in the text is κομψοί, which is so opposed to the sense of the passage, that the conjecture of Guietus, ἄκομψοι, has been adopted in the translation.

power of the word to such a degree, that through fear of what are called in the word "everlasting punishments," they despise all the tortures which are devised against them among men,—even death itself, with countless other evils,—which no wise man would say is the act of persons of wicked mind. How can temperance and sober-mindedness, or benevolence and liberality, be practised by a man of wicked mind? Nay, even the fear of God cannot be felt by such an one, with respect to which, because it is useful to the many, the gospel encourages those who are not yet able to choose that which ought to be chosen for its own sake, to select it as the greatest blessing, and one above all promise; for this principle cannot be implanted in him who prefers to live in wickedness.

Chapter LXXIX.

But if in these matters any one were to imagine that it is superstition rather than wickedness which appears in the multitude of those who believe the word, and should charge our doctrine with making men superstitious, we shall answer him by saying that, as a certain legislator replied to the question of one who asked him whether he had enacted for his citizens the best laws, that he had not given them absolutely the best, but the best which they were capable of receiving; so it might be said by the Father of the Christian doctrine, I have given the best laws and instruction for the improvement of morals of which the many were capable, not threatening sinners with imaginary labours and chastisements, but with such as are real, and necessary to be applied for the correction of those who offer resistance, although they do not at all understand the object of him who inflicts the punishment, nor the effect of the labours. For the doctrine of punishment is both attended with utility, and is agreeable to truth, and is stated in obscure terms with advantage. Moreover, as for the most part it is not the wicked whom the ambassadors of Christianity gain over, neither do we insult God. For we speak regarding Him both what is true, and what appears to be clear to the multitude, but not so clear to them as it is to those few who investigate the truths of the gospel in a philosophical manner.

Chapter LXXX.

Seeing, however, that Celsus alleges that "Christians are won over by us through vain hopes," we thus reply to him when he finds fault with our doctrine of the blessed life, and of communion with God: "As for you, good sir, they also are won over by vain hopes who have accepted the doctrine of Pythagoras and Plato regarding the soul, that it is its nature to ascend to the vault[1] of heaven, and in the super-celestial space to behold the sights which are seen by the blessed spectators above. According to you, O Celsus, they also who have accepted the doctrine of the duration of the soul [after death], and who lead a life through which they become heroes, and make their abodes with the gods, are won over by vain hopes. Probably also they who are persuaded that the soul comes [into the body] from without, and that it will be withdrawn from the power of death,[2] would be said by Celsus to be won over by empty hopes. Let him then come forth to the contest, no longer concealing the sect to which he belongs, but confessing himself to be an Epicurean, and let him meet the arguments, which are not lightly advanced among Greeks and barbarians, regarding the immortality of the soul, or its duration [after death], or the immortality of the thinking principle;[3] and let him prove that these are words which deceive with empty hopes those who give their assent to them; but that the adherents of his philosophical system are pure from empty hopes, and that they indeed lead to hopes of good, or—what is more in keeping with his opinions—give birth to no hope at all, on account of the immediate and complete destruction of the soul [after death]. Unless, perhaps, Celsus and the Epicureans will deny that it is a vain hope which they entertain regarding *their* end,—pleasure,—which, according to them, is

[1] ἀψῖδα.

[2] Τάχα δὲ καὶ οἱ πεισθέντες περὶ τοῦ θύραθεν νοῦν, ὡς θανάτου καινοῦ διεξαγωγὴν ἕξοντος, etc. Locus certe obscurus, cui lucem afferre conatur Boherellus, legendo divisim ὡς θανάτου καὶ νοῦ διεξαγωγὴν ἕξοντος, ut sensus sit "morti etiam mentem subductum iri." Nam si θύραθεν ἥκει νοῦς, consequens est ut θανάτου καὶ νοῦς διεξαγωγὴν ἔχῃ. Cf. Aristot. lib. ii. c. 3, *de generatione animalium*.—Spencer.

[3] ἢ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ ἀθανασίας.

the supreme good, and which consists in the permanent health of the body, and the hope regarding it which is entertained by Epicurus.[1]

Chapter LXXXI.

And do not suppose that it is not in keeping with the Christian religion for me to have accepted, against Celsus, the opinions of those philosophers who have treated of the immortality or after-duration of the soul; for, holding certain views in common with them, we shall more conveniently establish our position, that the future life of blessedness shall be for those only who have accepted the religion which is according to Jesus, and that devotion towards the Creator of all things which is pure and sincere, and unmingled with any created thing whatever. And let him who likes show what "better things" we persuade men to despise, and let him compare the blessed end with God in Christ,—that is, the word, and the wisdom, and all virtue,—which, according to our view, shall be bestowed, by the gift of God, on those who have lived a pure and blameless life, and who have felt a single and undivided love for the God of all things, with that end which is to follow according to the teaching of each philosophic sect, whether it be Greek or barbarian, or according to the professions of religious mysteries;[2] and let him prove that the end which is predicted by any of the others is superior to that which we promise, and consequently that that is true, and ours not befitting the gift of God, nor those who have lived a good life; or let him prove that these words were not spoken by the divine Spirit, who filled the souls of the holy prophets. And let him who likes show that those words which are acknowledged among all men to be human, are superior to those which are proved to be divine, and uttered by inspiration. And what are the "better" things from which we teach those who receive them that it would be better to abstain? For if it be not

[1] Εἰ μὴ ἄρα Κέλσος καὶ οἱ Ἐπικούρειοι οὐ φήσουσι κούφην εἶναι ἐλπίδα τὴν περὶ τοῦ τέλους αὐτῶν τῆς ἡδονῆς, ἥτις κατ' αὐτούς ἐστι τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς εὐσταθὲς κατάστημα, καὶ τὸ περὶ ταύτης πιστὸν Ἐπικούρῳ ἔλπισμα.

[2] τῷ καθ' ἑκάστην φιλοσόφων αἵρεσιν ἐν Ἕλλησιν ἢ βαρβάροις, ἢ μυστηριώδη ἐπαγγελίαν, τέλει.

arrogant so to speak, it is self-evident that nothing can be denied which is better than to entrust oneself to the God of all, and yield oneself up to the doctrine which raises us above all created things, and brings us, through the animate and living word—which is also living wisdom and the Son of God—to God who is over all. However, as the third book of our answers to the treatise of Celsus has extended to a sufficient length, we shall here bring our present remarks to a close, and in what is to follow shall meet what Celsus has subsequently written.

BOOK IV.

CHAPTER I.

HAVING, in the three preceding books, fully stated what occurred to us by way of answer to the treatise of Celsus, we now, reverend Ambrosius, with prayer to God through Christ, offer this fourth book as a reply to what follows. And we pray that words may be given us, as it is written in the book of Jeremiah that the Lord said to the prophet: "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth as fire. See, I have set thee this day over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, and to build and to plant."[1] For we need words now which will root out of every wounded soul the reproaches uttered against the truth by this treatise of Celsus, or which proceed from opinions like his. And we need also thoughts which will pull down all edifices based on false opinions, and especially the edifice raised by Celsus in his work, which resembles the building of those who said, "Come, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top shall reach to heaven."[2] Yea, we even require a wisdom which will throw down all high things that rise against the knowledge of God,[3] and especially that height of arrogance which Celsus displays against us. And in the next place, as we must not stop with rooting out and pulling down the hindrances which have just been mentioned, but must, in room of what has been rooted out, plant the plants of "God's husbandry;"[4] and in place of what has been pulled down, rear up the building of God, and the temple of His glory,—we must for that reason pray also to the Lord, who bestowed the gifts named in the book of Jeremiah, that He may grant even to us words adapted both for building up the [temple] of Christ, and for planting the spiritual law,

[1] Cf. Jer. i. 9, 10.
[2] Cf. Gen. xi. 4.
[3] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 5.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 9.

and the prophetic words referring to the same.[1] And above all is it necessary to show, as against the assertions of Celsus which follow those he has already made, that the prophecies regarding Christ are true predictions. For, arraying himself at the same time against both parties—against the Jews on the one hand, who deny that the advent of Christ has taken place, but who expect it as future, and against Christians on the other, who acknowledge that Jesus is the Christ spoken of in prophecy—he makes the following statement:—

Chapter ii.

"But that certain Christians and [all] Jews should maintain, the former that there *has* already descended, the latter that there *will* descend, upon the earth a certain God, or Son of a God, who will make the inhabitants of the earth righteous,[2] is a most shameless assertion, and one the refutation of which does not need many words." Now here he appears to pronounce correctly regarding not "certain" of the Jews, but *all* of them, that they imagine that there is a certain [God] who will descend upon the earth; and with regard to Christians, that *certain of them* say that he has already come down. For he means those who prove from the Jewish Scriptures that the advent of Christ has already taken place, and he seems to know that there are certain heretical sects which deny that Christ Jesus was predicted by the prophets. In the preceding pages, however, we have already discussed, to the best of our ability, the question of Christ having been the subject of prophecy, and therefore, to avoid tautology, we do not repeat much that might be advanced upon this head. Observe, now, that if he had wished with a kind of apparent force[3] to subvert faith in the prophetic writings, either with regard to the future or past advent of Christ, he ought to have set forth the prophecies themselves which we Christians and Jews quote in our discussions with each other. For in this way he would have appeared to turn aside those who are carried away by the plausible character[4] of the prophetic statements, as he regards it, from assenting to their truth, and from believing, on account

[1] τοὺς ἀνάλογον αὐτῷ προφητικοὺς λόγους.
[2] δικαιωτὴς.
[3] ἀκολουθίας.
[4] πιθανότητος.

of these prophecies, that Jesus is the Christ; whereas now, being unable to answer the prophecies relating to Christ, or else not knowing at all what are the prophecies relating to Him, he brings forward no prophetic declaration, although there are countless numbers which refer to Christ; but he thinks that he prefers an accusation against the prophetic Scriptures, while he does not even state what he himself would call their "plausible character!" He is not, however, aware that it is not at all the Jews who say that Christ will descend as a God, or the Son of a God, as we have shown in the foregoing pages. And when he asserts that "he is said by us to have already come, but by the Jews that his advent as Messiah[1] is still future," he appears by the very charge to censure our statement as one that is most shameless, and which needs no lengthened refutation.

Chapter iii.

And he continues: "What is the meaning of such a descent upon the part of God?" not observing that, according to our teaching, the meaning of the descent is pre-eminently to convert what are called in the Gospel the lost "sheep of the house of Israel;" and secondly, to take away from them, on account of their disobedience, what is called the "kingdom of God," and to give to other husbandmen than the ancient Jews, viz. to the Christians, who will render to God the fruits of His kingdom in due season (each action being a "fruit of the kingdom").[2] We shall therefore, out of a greater number, select a few remarks by way of answer to the question of Celsus, when he says, "What is the meaning of such a descent upon the part of God?" And Celsus here returns to himself an answer which would have been given neither by Jews nor by us, when he asks, "Was it in order to learn what goes on amongst men?" For not one of us asserts that it was in order to learn what goes on amongst men that Christ entered into this life. Immediately after, however, as if some would reply that it *was* "in order to learn what goes on among men," he makes this objection to his own statement: "Does he not know

[1] Δικαιωτὴς, not Δικαστής.

[2] τοὺς καρποὺς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ βασιλείας ἀποδώσουσι τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν τοῖς ἑκάστης πράξεως οὔσης καρποῦ τῆς βασιλείας καιροῖς.

all things?" Then, as if we were to answer that He *does* know all things, he raises a new question, saying, "Then he does know, but does not make [men] better, nor is it possible for him by means of his divine power to make [men] better." Now all this on his part is silly talk;[1] for God, by means of His word, which is continually passing from generation to generation into holy souls, and constituting them friends of God and prophets, *does* improve those who listen to His words; and by the coming of Christ He improves, through the doctrine of Christianity, not those who are unwilling, but those who have chosen the better life, and that which is pleasing to God. I do not know, moreover, what kind of improvement Celsus wished to take place when he raised the objection, asking, "Is it then not possible for him, by means of his divine power, to make [men] better, unless he send some one for that special purpose?"[2] Would he then have the improvement to take place by God's filling the minds of men with new ideas, removing at once the [inherent] wickedness, and implanting virtue [in its stead]?[3] Another person now would inquire whether this was not inconsistent or impossible in the very nature of things; we, however, would say, "Grant it to be so, and let it be possible." Where, then, is our free will?[4] and what credit is there in assenting to the truth? or how is the rejection of what is false praiseworthy? But even if it were once granted that such a course was not only possible, but could be accomplished with propriety [by God], why would not one rather inquire (asking a question like that of Celsus) why it was not possible for God, by means of His divine power, to create men who needed no improvement, but who were of themselves virtuous and perfect, evil being altogether non-existent? These questions may perplex ignorant and foolish individuals, but not him who sees into the nature of things;

[1] εὐήθως.

[2] The word φυσει which is found in the text seems out of place, and has been omitted in the translation, agreeably to the emendation of Boherellus.

[3] Ἆρα γὰρ ἤθελε φανταστουμένοις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, ἀπειληφότος μεν ἀθρόως τὴν κακίαν, ἐμφύοντος δὲ τὴν ἀρετην, τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν γενέσθαι;

[4] ποῦ οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν;

for if you take away the spontaneity of virtue, you destroy its essence. But it would need an entire treatise to discuss these matters; and on this subject the Greeks have expressed themselves at great length in their works on providence. They truly would not say what Celsus has expressed in words, that "God knows [all things] indeed, but does not make [men] better, nor is able to do so by His divine power." We ourselves have spoken in many parts of our writings on these points to the best of our ability, and the Holy Scriptures have established the same to those who are able to understand them.

Chapter iv.

The argument which Celsus employs against us and the Jews will be turned against himself thus: My good sir, does the God who is over all things know what takes place among men, or does He not know? Now if you admit the existence of a God and of providence, as your treatise indicates, He must of necessity know. And if He does know, why does He not make [men] better? Is it obligatory, then, on *us* to defend God's procedure in not making men better, although He knows their state, but not equally binding on *you*, who do not distinctly show by your treatise that you are an Epicurean, but pretend to recognise a providence, to explain why God, although knowing all that takes place among men, does not make them better, nor by divine power liberate all men from evil? We are not ashamed, however, to say that God is constantly sending [instructors] in order to make men better; for there are to be found amongst men reasons[1] given by God which exhort them to enter on a better life. But there are many diversities amongst those who serve God, and they are few in number who are perfect and pure ambassadors of the truth, and who produce a complete reformation, as did Moses and the prophets. But above all these, great was the reformation effected by Jesus, who desired to heal not only those who lived in one corner of the world, but as far as in Him lay, men in every country, for He came as the Saviour of *all* men.

[1] οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ βέλτιστα προκαλούμενοι λόγοι, Θεοῦ αὐτοὺς δεδωκότος, εἰσὶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

Chapter v.

The illustrious[1] Celsus, taking occasion I know not from what, next raises an additional objection against us, as if we asserted that "God Himself will come down to men." He imagines also that it follows from this, that "He has left His own abode;" for he does not know the power of God, and that "the Spirit of the Lord filleth the world, and that which upholdeth all things hath knowledge of the voice."[2] Nor is he able to understand the words, "Do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord."[3] Nor does he see that, according to the doctrine of Christianity, we all "in Him live, and move, and have our being,"[4] as Paul also taught in his address to the Athenians; and therefore, although the God of the universe should through His own power descend with Jesus into the life of men, and although the Word which was in the beginning with God, which is also God Himself, should come to us, He does not give His place or vacate His own seat, so that one place should be empty of Him, and another which did not formerly contain Him be filled. But the power and divinity of God comes through him whom God chooses, and resides in him in whom it finds a place, not changing its situation, nor leaving its own place empty and filling another: for, in speaking of His quitting one place and occupying another, we do not mean such expressions to be taken *topically;* but we say that the soul of the bad man, and of him who is overwhelmed in wickedness, is abandoned by God, while we mean that the soul of him who wishes to live virtuously, or of him who is making progress [in a virtuous life], or who is already living conformably thereto, is filled with or becomes a partaker of the Divine Spirit. It is not necessary, then, for the descent of Christ, or for the coming of God to men, that He should abandon a greater seat, and that things on earth should be changed, as Celsus imagines when he says, "If you were to change a single one, even the least, of things on earth, all things would be overturned and disappear." And if we must

[1] γενναιότατος.

[2] Wisd. Solom. i. 7, καὶ τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα γνῶσιν ἔχει φωνῆς.

[3] Cf. Jer. xxiii. 24.

[4] Cf. Acts xvii. 28.

speak of a change in any one by the appearing of the power of God, and by the entrance of the word among men, we shall not be reluctant to speak of changing from a wicked to a virtuous, from a dissolute to a temperate, and from a superstitious to a religious life, the person who has allowed the word of God to find entrance into his soul.

Chapter vi.

But if you will have us to meet the most ridiculous among the charges of Celsus, listen to him when he says: "Now God, being unknown amongst men, and deeming himself on that account to have less than his due,[1] would desire to make himself known, and to make trial both of those who believe upon him and of those who do not, like those of mankind who have recently come into the possession of riches, and who make a display of their wealth; and thus they testify to an excessive but very mortal ambition on the part of God."[2] We answer, then, that God, not being known by wicked men, would desire to make Himself known, not because He thinks that He meets with less than His due, but because the knowledge of Him will free the possessor from unhappiness. Nay, not even with the desire to try those who do or who do not believe upon Him, does He, by His unspeakable and divine power, Himself take up His abode in certain individuals, or send His Christ; but He does this in order to liberate from all their wretchedness those who do believe upon Him, and who accept His divinity, and that those who do *not* believe may no longer have this as a ground of excuse, viz. that their unbelief is the consequence of their not having heard the word of instruction. What argument, then, proves that it follows from our views that God, according to our representations, is "like those of mankind who have recently come into the possession of riches, and who make a display of their wealth?" For God makes no display towards us, from a desire that we should understand and consider His pre-eminence; but desiring that the blessedness which results from His being known by us should be implanted in our souls,

[1] *καὶ παρὰ τοῦτ' ἔλαττον ἔχειν δοκῶν.*

[2] *καθάπερ οἱ νεόπλουτοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιδεικτιῶντες, πολλήν τινα καὶ πάνυ θνητὴν φιλοτιμίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταμαρτυροῦσι.*

He brings it to pass through Christ, and His ever-indwelling word, that we come to an intimate fellowship[1] with Him. No mortal ambition, then, does the Christian doctrine testify as existing on the part of God.

Chapter vii.

I do not know how it is, that after the foolish remarks which he has made upon the subject which we have just been discussing, he should add the following, that "God does not desire to make himself known for his own sake, but because he wishes to bestow upon us the knowledge of himself for the sake of our salvation, in order that those who accept it may become virtuous and be saved, while those who do not accept may be shown to be wicked and be punished." And yet, after making such a statement, he raises a new objection, saying: "After so long a period of time,[2] then, did God now bethink himself of making men live righteous lives,[3] but neglect to do so before?" To which we answer, that there never was a time when God did not wish to make men live righteous lives; but He continually evinced His care for the improvement of the rational animal,[4] by affording him occasions for the exercise of virtue. For in every generation the wisdom of God, passing into those souls which it ascertains to be holy, converts them into friends and prophets of God. And there may be found in the sacred books [the names of] those who in each generation were holy, and were recipients of the Divine Spirit, and who strove to convert their contemporaries so far as in their power.

Chapter viii.

And it is not matter of surprise that in certain generations there have existed prophets who, in the reception of divine influence,[5] surpassed, by means of their stronger and more powerful [religious] life, other prophets who were their contemporaries, and others also who lived before and after them. And so it is not at all wonderful that there should also have been a time when something of surpassing excellence[6] took up

[1] οἰκειωσιν.
[2] μετὰ τοσοῦτον αἰῶνα.
[3] δικαιῶσαι.
[4] τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον.
[5] ἐν τῇ παραδοχῇ τῆς θειότητος.
[6] ἐξαίρετον τί χρῆμα.

its abode among the human race, and which was distinguished above all that preceded or even that followed it. But there is an element of profound mystery in the account of these things, and one which is incapable of being received by the popular understanding. And in order that these difficulties should be made to disappear, and that the objections raised against the advent of Christ should be answered—viz. that, "after so long a period of time, then, did God now bethink himself of making men live righteous lives, but neglect to do so before?"—it is necessary to touch upon the narrative of the divisions [of the nations], and to make it evident why it was, that "when the Most High divided the nations, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God, and the portion of the Lord was His people Jacob, Israel the cord of His inheritance;" [1] and it will be necessary to state the reason why the birth of each man took place within each particular boundary, under him who obtained the boundary by lot, and how it rightly happened that "the portion of the Lord was His people Jacob, and Israel the cord of His inheritance," and why formerly the portion of the Lord was His people Jacob, and Israel the cord of His inheritance. But with respect to those who come after, it is said to the Saviour by the Father, "Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession." [2] For there are certain connected and related reasons, bearing upon the different treatment of human souls, which are difficult to state and to investigate.[3]

Chapter ix.

There came, then, although Celsus may not wish to admit it, after the numerous prophets who were the reformers of that well-known Israel, the Christ, the Reformer of the whole world, who did not need to employ against men whips, and chains, and tortures, as was the case under the former economy. For when the sower went forth to sow, the doctrine sufficed to sow

[1] Deut. xxxii. 8, 9 (according to the LXX.). [2] Cf. Ps. ii. 8.

[3] *Εἰσὶ γάρ τινες εἱρμοὶ καὶ ἀκολουθίαι ἄφατοι καὶ ἀνεκδιήγητοι περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας ψυχὰς διαφόρου οἰκονομίας.*

the word everywhere. But if there is a time coming which will necessarily circumscribe the duration of the world, by reason of its having had a beginning, and if there is to be an end to the world, and after the end a just judgment of all things, it will be incumbent on him who treats the declarations of the Gospels philosophically, to establish these doctrines by arguments of all kinds, not only derived directly from the sacred Scriptures, but also by inferences deducible from them; while the more numerous and simpler class of believers, and those who are unable to comprehend the many varied aspects of the divine wisdom, must entrust themselves to God, and to the Saviour of our race, and be contented with His "ipse dixit,"[1] instead of this or any other demonstration whatever.

Chapter x.

In the next place, Celsus, as is his custom, having neither proved nor established anything, proceeds to say, as if we talked of God in a manner that was neither holy nor pious, that "it is perfectly manifest that they babble about God in a way that is neither holy nor reverential;" and he imagines that we do these things to excite the astonishment of the ignorant, and that we do not speak the truth regarding the necessity of punishments for those who have sinned. And accordingly he likens us to those who "in the Bacchic mysteries introduce phantoms and objects of terror." With respect to the mysteries of Bacchus, whether there is any reliable account of them, or none that is such, let the Greeks tell, and let Celsus and his boon-companions[2] listen. But we defend our own procedure, when we say that our object is to reform the human race, either by the threats of punishments which we are persuaded are necessary for the whole world,[3] and which perhaps are not without use[4] to those who are to endure them; or by the promises made to those who have lived virtuous lives, and in which are contained the statements regarding the blessed termination which is to be found in the kingdom of God, reserved for those who are worthy of becoming His subjects.

[1] αὐτὸς ἔφα. [2] συνθιασῶται. [3] τῷ παντὶ.

[4] οὐκ ἀχρήστους. On Origen's views respecting rewards and punishments, cf. Huet's *Origeniana*, Book ii. question xi.

Chapter xi.

After this, being desirous to show that it is nothing either wonderful or new which we state regarding floods or conflagrations, but that, from misunderstanding the accounts of these things which are current among Greeks or barbarous nations, we have accorded our belief to our own Scriptures when treating of them, he writes as follows: "The belief has spread among them, from a misunderstanding of the accounts of these occurrences, that after lengthened cycles of time, and the returns and conjunctions of planets, conflagrations and floods are wont to happen, and because after the last flood, which took place in the time of Deucalion, the lapse of time, agreeably to the vicissitude of all things, requires a conflagration; and this made them give utterance to the erroneous opinion that God will descend, bringing fire like a torturer." Now in answer to this we say, that I do not understand how Celsus, who has read a great deal, and who shows that he has perused many histories, had not his attention arrested[1] by the antiquity of Moses, who is related by certain Greek historians to have lived about the time of Inachus the son of Phoroneus, and is acknowledged by the Egyptians to be a man of great antiquity, as well as by those who have studied the history of the Phœnicians. And any one who likes may peruse the two books of Flavius Josephus on the antiquities of the Jews, in order that he may see in what way Moses was more ancient than those who asserted that floods and conflagrations take place in the world after long intervals of time; which statement Celsus alleges the Jews and Christians to have misunderstood, and, not comprehending what was said about a conflagration, to have declared that "God will descend, bringing fire like a torturer."[2]

Chapter xii.

Whether, then, there are cycles of time, and floods, or conflagrations which occur periodically or not, and whether the Scripture is aware of this, not only in many passages, but especially where Solomon says, "What is the thing which

[1] οὐκ ἐπέστη. [2] δίκην βασανιστοῦ πῦρ φέρων.

hath been? Even that which shall be. And what is the thing which hath been done? Even that which shall be done,"[1] etc. etc., belongs not to the present occasion to discuss. For it is sufficient only to observe, that Moses and certain of the prophets, being men of very great antiquity, did not receive from others the statements relating to the [future] conflagration of the world; but, on the contrary (if we must attend to the matter of time[2]), others rather misunderstanding them, and not inquiring accurately into their statements, invented the fiction of the same events recurring at certain intervals, and differing neither in their essential nor accidental qualities.[3] But we do not refer either the deluge or the conflagration to cycles and planetary periods; but the cause of them we declare to be the extensive prevalence of wickedness,[4] and its [consequent] removal by a deluge or a conflagration. And if the voices of the prophets say that God "comes down," who has said, "Do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord,"[5] the term is used in a figurative sense. For God "comes down" from His own height and greatness when He arranges the affairs of men, and especially those of the wicked. And as custom leads men to say that teachers "condescend"[6] to children, and wise men to those youths who have just betaken themselves to philosophy, not by "descending" in a *bodily* manner; so, if God is said anywhere in the Holy Scriptures to "come down," it is understood as spoken in conformity with the usage which so employs the word, and in like manner also with the expression "go up."

Chapter xiii.

But as it is in mockery that Celsus says we speak of "God coming down like a torturer bearing fire," and thus compels us unseasonably to investigate words of deeper meaning, we shall make a few remarks, sufficient to enable our hearers to form an idea[7] of the defence which disposes of the ridicule of Celsus against us, and then we shall turn to what follows. The divine

[1] Cf. Eccles. i. 9.

[2] εἰ χρὴ ἐπιστησαντα τοῖς χρόνοις εἰπεῖν.

[3] ἀνέπλασαν κατὰ περιόδους ταυτότητας, καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτους τοῖς ἰδίοις ποιοῖς καὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν αὐτοῖς.

[4] κακίαν ἐπὶ πλεῖον χεομένην.

[5] Cf. Jer. xiii. 24.

[6] συγκαταβαινειν.

[7] γεῦσαι.

word says that our God is "a consuming fire,"[1] and that "He draws rivers of fire before Him;"[2] nay, that He even entereth in as "a refiner's fire, and as a fuller's herb,"[3] to purify His own people. But when He is said to be a "consuming fire," we inquire what are the things which are appropriate to be consumed by God. And we assert that they are wickedness, and the works which result from it, and which, being figuratively called "wood, hay, stubble,"[4] God consumes as a fire. The wicked man, accordingly, is said to build up on the previously-laid foundation of reason, "wood, and hay, and stubble." If, then, any one can show that these words were differently understood by the writer, and can prove that the wicked man *literally*[5] builds up "wood, or hay, or stubble," it is evident that the fire must be understood to be material, and an object of sense. But if, on the contrary, the works of the wicked man are spoken of *figuratively* under the names of "wood, or hay, or stubble," why does it not at once occur [to inquire] in what sense the word "fire" is to be taken, so that "wood" of such a kind should be consumed? for [the Scripture] says: "The fire will try each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work be burned, he shall suffer loss."[6] But what work can be spoken of in these words as being "burned," save all that results from wickedness? Therefore our God is a "consuming fire" in the sense in which we have taken the word; and thus He enters in as a "refiner's fire," to refine the rational nature, which has been filled with the lead of wickedness, and to free it from the other impure materials, which adulterate the natural gold or silver, so to speak, of the soul.[7] And, in like manner, "rivers of fire" are said to be before God, who will thoroughly cleanse away the evil which is intermingled throughout the whole soul. But these remarks are sufficient in answer to the assertion, "that thus they were made to give expression to the erroneous opinion that God will come down bearing fire like a torturer."

[1] Cf. Deut. iv. 24, ix. 3. [2] Cf. Dan. vii. 10. [3] Cf. Mal. iii. 2.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 12. [5] *σωματικῶς.* [6] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 13–15.
[7] *τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ (ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω), φύσιν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἢ τὴν ἀργύρου, δολωσάντων.*

Chapter xiv.

But let us look at what Celsus next with great ostentation announces in the following fashion: "And again," he says, "let us resume the subject from the beginning, with a larger array of proofs. And I make no new statement, but say what has been long settled. God is good, and beautiful, and blessed, and that in the best and most beautiful degree.[1] But if he come down among men, he must undergo a change, and a change from good to evil, from virtue to vice, from happiness to misery, and from best to worst. Who, then, would make choice of such a change? It is the nature of a mortal, indeed, to undergo change and remoulding, but of an immortal to remain the same and unaltered. God, then, could not admit of such a change." Now it appears to me that the fitting answer has been returned to these objections, when I have related what is called in Scripture the "condescension"[2] of God to human affairs; for which purpose He did not need to undergo a transformation, as Celsus thinks we assert, nor a change from good to evil, nor from virtue to vice, nor from happiness to misery, nor from best to worst. For, continuing unchangeable in His essence, He condescends to human affairs by the economy of His providence.[3] We show, accordingly, that the Holy Scriptures represent God as unchangeable, both by such words as "Thou art the same,"[4] and "I change not;"[5] whereas the gods of Epicurus, being composed of atoms, and, so far as their structure is concerned, capable of dissolution, endeavour to throw off the atoms which contain the elements of destruction. Nay, even the god of the Stoics, as being corporeal, at one time has his whole essence composed of the guiding principle[6] when the conflagration [of the world] takes place; and at another, when a rearrangement of things occurs, he again becomes partly material.[7] For even the Stoics were unable dis-

[1] Ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαθός ἐστι, καὶ καλὸς, καὶ εὐδαίμων, καὶ ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ καὶ ἀρίστῳ.

[2] κατάβασιν. [3] τῇ προνοίᾳ καὶ τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ. [4] Ps. cii. 27.

[5] Mal. iii. 6. [6] ἡγεμονικόν.

[7] The reading in the text is, ἐπὶ μέρους γίνεται αὐτῆς, which is thus corrected by Guietus: ἐπιμερὴς γίνεται αὐτός.

tinctly to comprehend the natural idea of God, as of a being altogether incorruptible and simple, and uncompounded and indivisible.

Chapter xv.

And with respect to His having descended among men, He was "previously in the form of God;"[1] and through benevolence, divested Himself [of His glory], that He might be capable of being received by men. But He did not, I imagine, undergo any change from "good to evil," for "He did no *sin;*"[2] nor from "virtue to vice," for "He knew no *sin*."[3] Nor did He pass from "happiness to misery," but He humbled Himself, and nevertheless was blessed, even when His humiliation was undergone in order to benefit our race. Nor was there any change in Him from "best to worst," for how can goodness and benevolence be of "the worst?" Is it befitting to say of the physician, who looks on dreadful sights and handles unsightly objects in order to cure the sufferers, that he passes from "good to evil," or from "virtue to vice," or from "happiness to misery?" And yet the physician, in looking on dreadful sights and handling unsightly objects, does not wholly escape the possibility of being involved in the same fate. But He who heals the wounds of our souls, through the word of God that is in Him, is Himself incapable of admitting any wickedness. But if the immortal God—the Word—by assuming a mortal body and a human soul, appears to Celsus to undergo a change and transformation, let him learn that the Word, still remaining essentially the Word, suffers none of those things which are suffered by the body or the soul; but, condescending occasionally to [the weakness of] him who is unable to look upon the splendours and brilliancy of Deity, He becomes as it were flesh, speaking with a literal voice, until he who has received Him in such a form is able, through being elevated in some slight degree by the teaching of the Word, to gaze upon what is, so to speak, His real and pre-eminent appearance.[4]

[1] Cf. Phil. ii. 6, 7.
[2] Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 22.
[3] Cf. 2 Cor. v. 21.
[4] προηγουμένην.

Chapter xvi.

For there are different appearances, as it were, of the Word, according as He shows Himself to each one of those who come to His doctrine; and this in a manner corresponding to the condition of him who is just becoming a disciple, or of him who has made a little progress, or of him who has advanced further, or of him who has already *nearly* attained to virtue, or who has even *already* attained it. And hence it is not the case, as Celsus and those like him would have it, that our God was transformed, and ascending the lofty mountain, showed that His real appearance was something different, and far more excellent than what those who remained below, and were unable to follow Him on high, beheld. For those below did not possess eyes capable of seeing the transformation of the Word into His glorious and more divine condition. But with difficulty were they able to receive Him as He was; so that it might be said of Him by those who were unable to behold His more excellent nature: "We saw Him, and He had no form nor comeliness; but His form was mean,[1] and inferior to that of the sons of men."[2] And let these remarks be an answer to the suppositions of Celsus, who does not understand the changes or transformations of Jesus, as related in the histories, nor His mortal and immortal nature.

Chapter xvii.

But will not those narratives, especially when they are understood in their proper sense, appear far more worthy of respect than the story that Dionysus was deceived by the Titans, and expelled from the throne of Jupiter, and torn in pieces by them, and his remains being afterwards put together again, he returned as it were once more to life, and ascended to heaven? Or are the Greeks at liberty to refer such stories to the doctrine of the soul, and to interpret them figuratively, while the door of a consistent explanation, and one everywhere in accord and harmony with the writings of the Divine Spirit, who had His abode in pure souls, is closed against *us?* Celsus, then, is altogether ignorant of the purpose of our writings, and it is there-

[1] ἄτιμον. [2] ἐκλεῖπον.

fore upon his own acceptation of them that he casts discredit, and not upon their real meaning; whereas, if he had reflected on what is appropriate[1] to a soul which is to enjoy an everlasting life, and on the opinion which we are to form of its essence and principles, he would not so have ridiculed the entrance of the immortal into a mortal body, which took place not according to the metempsychosis of Plato, but agreeably to another and higher view of things. And he would have observed one "descent," distinguished by its great benevolence, undertaken to convert (as the Scripture mystically terms them) the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," which had strayed down from the mountains, and to which the Shepherd is said in certain parables to have gone down, leaving on the mountains those "which had not strayed."

Chapter xviii.

But Celsus, lingering over matters which he does not understand, leads us to be guilty of tautology, as we do not wish even in appearance to leave any one of his objections unexamined. He proceeds, accordingly, as follows: "God either really changes himself, as these assert, into a mortal body, and the impossibility of that has been already declared; or else he does *not* undergo a change, but only causes the beholders to imagine so, and thus deceives them, and is guilty of falsehood. Now deceit and falsehood are nothing but evils, and would only be employed as a medicine, either in the case of sick and lunatic friends, with a view to their cure, or in that of enemies when one is taking measures to escape danger. But no sick man or lunatic is a friend of God, nor does God fear any one to such a degree as to shun danger by leading him into error." Now the answer to these statements might have respect partly to the nature of the Divine Word, who is God, and partly to the soul of Jesus. As respects the nature of the Word, in the same way as the quality of the food changes in the nurse into milk with reference to the nature of the child, or is arranged by the physician with a view to the good of his health in the case of a sick man, or [is specially] prepared for a stronger man, because he possesses greater vigour, so does God appropriately change,

[1] τί ἀκολουθεῖ.

in the case of each individual, the power of the Word to which belongs the natural property of nourishing the human soul. And to one is given, as the Scripture terms it, "the sincere milk of the word;" and to another, who is weaker, as it were, "herbs;" and to another who is full-grown, "strong meat." And the Word does not, I imagine, prove false to His own nature, in contributing nourishment to each one, according as he is capable of receiving Him. Nor does He mislead or prove false. But if one were to take the change as referring to the soul of Jesus after it had entered a body, we would inquire in what sense the term "change" is used. For if it be meant to apply to its essence, such a supposition is inadmissible, not only in relation to the soul of Jesus, but also to the rational soul of any other being. And if it be alleged that it suffers anything from the body when united with it, or from the place to which it has come, then what inconvenience[1] can happen to the Word who, in great benevolence, brought down a Saviour to the human race?—seeing none of those who formerly professed to effect a cure could accomplish so much as that soul showed *it* could do, by what it performed, even by voluntarily descending to the level of human destinies for the benefit of our race. And the Divine Word, well knowing this, speaks to that effect in many passages of Scripture, although it is sufficient at present to quote one testimony of Paul to the following effect: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name."[2]

Chapter xix.

Others, then, may concede to Celsus that God does not undergo a change, but leads the spectators to imagine that He does; whereas we who are persuaded that the advent of Jesus among men was no mere appearance, but a real manifestation,

[1] τί ἄτοπον. [2] Phil. ii. 5–9.

are not affected by this charge of Celsus. We nevertheless will attempt a reply, because you assert, Celsus, do you not, that it is sometimes allowable to employ deceit and falsehood by way, as it were, of medicine?[1] Where, then, is the absurdity, if such a saving result were to be accomplished, that some such events should have taken place? For certain words, when savouring of falsehood, produce upon such characters a corrective effect (like the similar declarations of physicians to their patients), rather than when spoken in the spirit of truth. This, however, must be our defence against other opponents. For there is no absurdity in Him who healed sick friends, healing the dear human race by means of such remedies as He would not employ preferentially, but only according to circumstances.[2] The human race, moreover, when in a state of mental alienation, had to be cured by methods which the Word saw would aid in bringing back those so afflicted to a sound state of mind. But Celsus says also, that "one acts thus towards enemies when taking measures to escape danger. But God does not fear any one, so as to escape danger by leading into error those who conspire against him." Now it is altogether unnecessary and absurd to answer a charge which is advanced by no one against our Saviour. And we have already replied, when answering other charges, to the statement that "no one who is either in a state of sickness or mental alienation is a friend of God." For the answer is, that such arrangements have been made, not for the sake of those who, being already friends, afterwards fell sick or became afflicted with mental disease, but in order that those who were still enemies through sickness of the soul, and alienation of the natural reason, might become the friends of God. For it is distinctly stated that Jesus endured all things on behalf of sinners, that He might free them from sin, and convert them to righteousness.

Chapter xx.

In the next place, as he represents the Jews accounting in

[1] ὅμως δ' ἀπολογησόμεθα, ὅτι οὐ φῂς, ὦ Κέλσε, ὡς ἐν Φαρμάκου μοίρᾳ ποτὲ δίδοται χρῆσθαι τῷ πλανᾷν καὶ τῷ ψεύδεσθαι.

[2] προηγουμένως, ἀλλ' ἐκ περιστάσεως.

a way peculiar to themselves for their belief that the advent of Christ among them is still in the future, and the Christians as maintaining in *their* way that the coming of the Son of God into the life of men has already taken place, let us, as far as we can, briefly consider these points. According to Celsus, the Jews say that "[human] life, being filled with all wickedness, needed one sent from God, that the wicked might be punished, and all things purified in a manner analogous to the first deluge which happened." And as the Christians are said to make statements additional to this, it is evident that he alleges that they admit these. Now, where is the absurdity in the coming of one who is, on account of the prevailing flood of wickedness, to purify the world, and to treat every one according to his deserts? For it is not in keeping with the character of God that the diffusion of wickedness should not cease, and all things be renewed. The Greeks, moreover, know of the earth's being purified at certain times by a deluge or a fire, as Plato, too, says somewhere to this effect: "And when the gods overwhelm the earth, purifying it with water, some of them on the mountains,"[1] etc. etc. Must it be said, then, that if the Greeks make such assertions, they are to be deemed worthy of respect and consideration, but that if we too maintain certain of these views, which are quoted with approval by the Greeks, they cease to be honourable? And yet they who care to attend to the connection and truth of all our records, will endeavour to establish not only the antiquity of the writers, but the venerable nature of their writings, and the consistency of their several parts.

Chapter xxi.

But I do not understand how he can imagine the overturning of the tower [of Babel] to have happened with a similar object to that of the deluge, which effected a purification of the earth, according to the accounts both of Jews and Christians. For, in order that the narrative contained in Genesis respecting the tower may be held to convey no secret meaning, but, as Celsus supposes, may be taken as true to the letter,[2] the event does not on such a view appear to have taken place for the purpose of purifying the earth; unless, indeed, he imagines that the so-

[1] Cf. Plato in the *Timæus*, and Book iii. *de legibus*.

[2] σαφῆς.

called confusion of tongues is such a purificatory process. But on this point, he who has the opportunity will treat more seasonably when his object is to show not only what is the meaning of the narrative in its historical connection, but what metaphorical meaning may be deduced from it.[1] Seeing that he imagines, however, that Moses, who wrote the account of the tower, and the confusion of tongues, has perverted the story of the sons of Aloeus,[2] and referred it to the tower, we must remark that I do not think any one prior to the time of Homer[3] has mentioned the sons of Aloeus, while I am persuaded that what is related about the tower has been recorded by Moses as being much older not only than Homer, but even than the invention of letters among the Greeks. Who, then, are the perverters of each other's narratives? Whether do they who relate the story of the Aloadæ pervert the history of the time, or he who wrote the account of the tower and the confusion of tongues the story of the Aloadæ? Now to impartial hearers Moses appears to be more ancient than Homer. The destruction by fire, moreover, of Sodom and Gomorrha on account of their sins, related by Moses in Genesis, is compared by Celsus to the story of Phaethon,—all these statements of his resulting from one blunder, viz. his not attending to the [greater] antiquity of Moses. For they who relate the story of Phaethon seem to be younger even than Homer, who, again, is much younger than Moses. We do not deny, then, that the purificatory fire and the destruction of the world took place in order that evil might be swept away, and all things be renewed; for we assert that we have learned these things from the sacred books of the prophets. But since, as we have said in the preceding pages, the prophets, in uttering many predictions regarding future events, show that they have spoken the truth concerning many things that are past, and thus give evidence of the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, it is manifest that, with respect to things still future, we should repose faith in them, or rather in the Divine Spirit that is in them.

[1] Ἐπὰν τὸ προκείμενον ᾖ παραστῆσαι καὶ τὰ τῆς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἱστορίας τίνα ἔχοι λόγον, καὶ τὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀναγωγῆς.

[2] Otus and Ephialtes. Cf. Smith's *Dict. of Myth. and Biog. s.v.*

[3] Cf. Hom. *Odyss.* xi. 305.

Chapter xxii.

But, according to Celsus, "the Christians, making certain additional statements to those of the Jews, assert that the Son of God has been already sent on account of the sins of the Jews; and that the Jews having chastised Jesus, and given him gall to drink, have brought upon themselves the divine wrath." And any one who likes may convict this statement of falsehood, if it be not the case that the whole Jewish nation was overthrown within one single generation after Jesus had undergone these sufferings at their hands. For forty and two years, I think, after the date of the crucifixion of Jesus, did the destruction of Jerusalem take place. Now it has never been recorded, since the Jewish nation began to exist, that they have been expelled for so long a period from their venerable temple-worship[1] and service, and enslaved by more powerful nations; for if at any time they appeared to be abandoned because of their sins, they were notwithstanding visited [by God],[2] and returned to their own country, and recovered their possessions, and performed unhindered the observances of their law. One fact, then, which proves that Jesus was something divine and sacred,[3] is this, that Jews should have suffered on His account now for a lengthened time calamities of such severity. And we say with confidence that they will never be restored to their former condition.[4] For they committed a crime of the most unhallowed kind, in conspiring against the Saviour of the human race in that city where they offered up to God a worship containing the symbols of mighty mysteries. It accordingly behoved that city where Jesus underwent these sufferings to perish utterly, and the Jewish nation to be overthrown, and the invitation to happiness offered them by God to pass to others,—the Christians, I mean, to whom has come the doctrine of a pure and holy worship, and who have obtained new laws, in harmony with the established constitution in all countries;[5] seeing those which were formerly imposed, as on a single

[1] ἁγιστείας. [2] ἐπεσκοπηθήσαν.
[3] Θεῖον τι καὶ ἱερὸν χρῆμα γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
[4] οὐδ' ἀποκατασταθήσονται.
[5] καὶ ἁρμόζοντας τῇ παντα χοῦ καθεστώσῃ πολιτείᾳ.

nation which was ruled by princes of its own race and of similar manners,[1] could not now be observed in all their entireness.

Chapter xxiii.

In the next place, ridiculing after his usual style the race of Jews and Christians, he compares them all "to a flight of bats or to a swarm of ants issuing out of their nest, or to frogs holding council in a marsh, or to worms crawling together in the corner of a dunghill, and quarrelling with one another as to which of them were the greater sinners, and asserting that God shows and announces to us all things beforehand; and that, abandoning the whole world, and the regions of heaven,[2] and this great earth, he becomes a citizen[3] among us alone, and to us alone makes his intimations, and does not cease sending and inquiring, in what way we may be associated with him for ever." And in his fictitious representation, he compares us to "worms which assert that there is a God, and that immediately after him, we who are made by him are altogether like unto God, and that all things have been made subject to us,—earth, and water, and air, and stars,—and that all things exist for our sake, and are ordained to be subject to us." And, according to his representation, the worms—that is, we ourselves—say that "now, since certain amongst us commit sin, God will come or will send his Son to consume the wicked with fire, that the rest of us may have eternal life with him." And to all this he subjoins the remark, that "such wranglings would be more endurable amongst worms and frogs than betwixt Jews and Christians."

Chapter xxiv.

In reply to these, we ask of those who accept such aspersions as are scattered against us, Do you regard all men as a collection of bats, or as frogs, or as worms, in consequence of the pre-eminence of God? or do you not include the rest of mankind in this proposed comparison, but on account of their possession of reason, and of the established laws, treat *them* as men, while you hold cheap[4] *Christians* and *Jews*, because their opinions

[1] ὑπὸ οἰκείων καὶ ὁμοήθων.
[2] τὴν οὐράνιον Φοράν.
[3] ἐμπολιτεύεται.
[4] ἐξευτελίζοντες.

are distasteful to you, and compare them to the animals above mentioned? And whatever answer you may return to our question, we shall reply by endeavouring to show that such assertions are most unbecoming, whether spoken of all men in general, or of us in particular. For, let it be supposed that you say justly that all men, as compared with God, are [rightly] likened to these worthless[1] animals, since their littleness is not at all to be compared with the superiority of God, what then do you mean by littleness? Answer me, good sirs. If you refer to littleness of body, know that superiority and inferiority, if truth is to be judge, are not determined by a bodily standard.[2] For, on such a view, vultures[3] and elephants would be superior to us men; for they are larger, and stronger, and longer-lived than we. But no sensible person would maintain that these irrational creatures are superior to rational beings, merely on account of their bodies: for the possession of reason raises a rational being to a vast superiority over all irrational creatures. Even the race of virtuous and blessed beings would admit this, whether they are, as ye say, good demons, or, as we are accustomed to call them, the angels of God, or any other natures whatever superior to that of man, since the rational faculty within them has been made perfect, and endowed with all virtuous qualities.[4]

Chapter xxv.

But if you depreciate the littleness of man, not on account of his body, but of his soul, regarding it as inferior to that of other rational beings, and especially of those who are virtuous; and inferior, because evil dwells in it,—why should those among Christians who are wicked, and those among the Jews who lead sinful lives, be termed a collection of bats, or ants, or worms, or frogs, rather than those individuals among other nations who are guilty of wickedness?—seeing, in this respect, any individual whatever, especially if carried away by the tide of evil, is, in comparison with the rest of mankind, a bat, and worm, and frog, and ant. And although a man may be an orator like Demosthenes, yet, if stained with wickedness like

[1] εὐτελέσι.
[2] οὐκ ἐν σώματι κρίνεται.
[3] γύπες; γρύπες?
[4] καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν πεποίωται.

his,[1] and guilty of deeds proceeding, like his, from a wicked nature; or an Antiphon, who was also considered to be indeed an orator, yet who annihilated the doctrine of providence in his writings, which were entitled *Concerning Truth*, like that discourse of Celsus,—such individuals are notwithstanding worms, rolling in a corner of the dung-heap of stupidity and ignorance. Indeed, whatever be the nature of the rational faculty, it could not reasonably be compared to a worm, because it possesses capabilities of virtue.[2] For these adumbrations[3] towards virtue do not allow of those who possess the power of acquiring it, and who are incapable of wholly losing its seeds, to be likened to a worm. It appears, therefore, that neither can men in general be deemed worms in comparison with God. For reason, having its beginning in the reason of God, cannot allow of the rational animal being considered wholly alien from Deity. Nor can those among Christians and Jews who are wicked, and who, in truth, are neither Christians nor Jews, be compared, more than other wicked men, to worms rolling in a corner of a dunghill. And if the nature of reason will not permit of such comparisons, it is manifest that we must not calumniate human nature, which has been formed for virtue, even if it should sin through ignorance, nor liken it to animals of the kind described.

Chapter xxvi.

But if it is on account of those opinions of the Christians and Jews which displease Celsus (and which he does not at all appear to understand) that they are to be regarded as worms and ants, and the rest of mankind as different, let us examine the acknowledged opinions of Christians and Jews,[4] and compare them with those of the rest of mankind, and see whether it will not appear to those who have once admitted that certain men are worms and ants, that *they* are the worms and ants and frogs who have fallen away from sound views of God, and,

[1] The allusion may possibly be to his flight from the field of Chæronea, or to his avarice, or to the alleged impurity of his life, which is referred to by Plutarch in his *Lives of the Ten Orators*.—Spencer.

[2] ἀφορμὰς ἔχον πρὸς ἀρετήν.

[3] ὑποτυπώσεις.

[4] τὰ αὐτόθεν πᾶσι προφαινόμενα δόγματα Χριστιανῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων.

under a vain appearance of piety,[1] worship either irrational animals, or images, or other objects, the works of men's hands;[2] whereas, from the beauty of such, they ought to admire the Maker of them, and worship Him: while those are indeed men, and more honourable than men (if there be anything that is so), who, in obedience to their reason, are able to ascend from stocks and stones,[3] nay, even from what is reckoned the most precious of all matter—silver and gold; and who ascend up also from the beautiful things in the world to the Maker of all, and entrust themselves to Him who alone is able to satisfy[4] all existing things, and to overlook the thoughts of all, and to hear the prayers of all; who send up their prayers to Him, and do all things as in the presence of Him who beholds everything, and who are careful, as in the presence of the Hearer of all things, to say nothing which might not with propriety be reported to God. Will not such piety as this—which can be overcome neither by labours, nor by the dangers of death, nor by logical plausibilities[5]—be of no avail in preventing those who have obtained it from being any longer compared to worms, even if they had been so represented before their assumption of a piety so remarkable? Will they who subdue that fierce longing for sexual pleasures which has reduced the souls of many to a weak and feeble condition, and who subdue it because they are persuaded that they cannot otherwise have communion with God, unless they ascend to Him through the exercise of temperance, appear to you to be the brothers of worms, and relatives of ants, and to bear a likeness to frogs? What! is the brilliant quality of justice, which keeps inviolate the rights common to our neighbour, and our kindred, and which observes fairness, and benevolence, and goodness, of no avail in saving him who practises it from being termed a bird of the night? And are not they who wallow in dissoluteness, as do the majority of mankind, and they who associate promiscuously with common harlots, and who teach that such practices are not wholly contrary to propriety, worms who roll in mire?—especially when they are compared with those who have been taught not to take the "members of Christ," and the body inhabited by the Word,

[1] *φαντασίᾳ δ' εὐσεβείας.* [2] *ἢ καὶ τὰ δημιουργήματα.* [3] *λίθων καὶ ξύλων.*
[4] *διαοκεῖν.* [5] *ὑπὸ λογικῶν πιθανοτήτων.*

and make them the "members of a harlot;" and who have already learned that the body of the rational being, as consecrated to the God of all things, is the temple of the God whom they worship, becoming such from the pure conceptions which they entertain of the Creator, and who also, being careful not to corrupt the temple of God by unlawful pleasure, practise temperance as constituting piety towards God!

Chapter xxvii.

And I have not yet spoken of the other evils which prevail amongst men, from which even those who have the appearance of philosophers are not speedily freed, for in philosophy there are many pretenders. Nor do I say anything on the point that many such evils are found to exist among those who are neither Jews nor Christians. Of a truth, such evil practices do not at all prevail among *Christians*, if you properly examine what constitutes a Christian. Or, if any persons of that kind should be discovered, they are at least not to be found among those who frequent the assemblies, and come to the public prayers, without their being excluded from them, unless it should happen, and that rarely, that some one individual of such a character escapes notice in the crowd. We, then, are not worms who assemble together; who take our stand against the Jews on those Scriptures which they believe to be divine, and who show that He who was spoken of in prophecy *has* come, and that *they* have been abandoned on account of the greatness of their sins, and that *we* who have accepted the Word have the highest hopes in God, both because of our faith in Him, and of His ability to receive us into His communion pure from all evil and wickedness of life. If a man, then, should call himself a Jew or a Christian, he would not say without qualification that God had made the whole world, and the vault of heaven[1] for us in particular. But if a man is, as Jesus taught, pure in heart, and meek, and peaceful, and cheerfully submits to dangers for the sake of his religion, such an one might reasonably have confidence in God, and with a full apprehension of the word contained in the prophecies, might say this also: "All these things has God shown beforehand, and announced to us who believe."

[1] τὴν οὐράνιον φοράν.

Chapter xxviii.

But since he has represented those whom he regards as worms, viz. the Christians, as saying that "God, having abandoned the heavenly regions, and despising this great earth, takes up His abode amongst us alone, and to us alone makes His announcements, and ceases not His messages and inquiries as to how we may become His associates for ever," we have to answer that he attributes to us words which we never uttered, seeing we both read and know that God loves all existing things, and loathes[1] nothing which He has made, for He would not have created anything in hatred. We have, moreover, read the declaration: "And Thou sparest all things, because they are Thine, O lover of souls. For Thine incorruptible Spirit is in all. And therefore those also who have fallen away for a little time Thou rebukest, and admonishest, reminding them of their sins."[2] How can we assert that "God, leaving the regions of heaven, and the whole world, and despising this great earth, takes up His abode amongst us only," when we have found that all thoughtful persons must say in their prayers, that "the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord,"[3] and that "the mercy of the Lord is upon all flesh;"[4] and that God, being good, "maketh His sun to arise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth His rain upon the just and the unjust;"[5] and that He encourages us to a similar course of action, in order that we may become His sons, and teaches us to extend the benefits which we enjoy, so far as in our power, to all men? For He Himself is said to be the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe;[6] and His Christ to be the "propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."[7] And this, then, is our answer to the allegations of Celsus. Certain other statements, in keeping with the character of the Jews, might be made by some of that nation, but certainly not by the Christians, who have been taught that "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;"[8] and

[1] βδελύσσεται.
[2] Cf. Wisd. of Solom. xi. 26, xii. 1, 2.
[3] Ps. xxxiii. 5.
[4] Ecclus. xviii. 13.
[5] Cf. Matt. v. 45.
[6] Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 10.
[7] Cf. 1 John ii. 2.
[8] Cf. Rom. v. 8.

although "scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die."[1] But now is Jesus declared to have come for the sake of sinners in all parts of the world (that they may forsake their sin, and entrust themselves to God), being called also, agreeably to an ancient custom of these Scriptures, the "Christ of God."

Chapter xxix.

But Celsus perhaps has misunderstood certain of those whom he has termed "worms," when they affirm that "God exists, and that *we* are next to Him." And he acts like those who would find fault with an entire sect of philosophers, on account of certain words uttered by some rash youth who, after a three days' attendance upon the lectures of a philosopher, should exalt himself above other people as inferior to himself, and devoid of philosophy. For we know that there are many creatures more honourable[2] than man; and we have read that "God standeth in the congregation of gods,"[3] but of gods who are not worshipped by the nations, "for all the gods of the nations are idols."[4] We have read also, that "God, standing in the congregation of the gods, judgeth among the gods."[5] We know, moreover, that "though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him."[6] And we know that in this way the angels are superior to men; so that men, when made perfect, become like the angels. "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but the righteous are as the angels in heaven,"[7] and also become "equal to the angels."[8] We know, too, that in the arrangement of the universe there are certain beings termed "thrones," and others "dominions," and others "powers," and others "principalities;" and we see that we men, who are far inferior to these, may entertain the hope that by a virtuous life, and by acting in all things agreeably to reason, we may rise to a likeness with all

[1] Cf. Rom. v. 7.
[2] τιμιώτερα.
[3] Cf. Ps. lxxxii. 1.
[4] δαιμόνια. Cf. Ps. xcvi. 5.
[5] Cf. Ps. lxxxii. 1.
[6] 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.
[7] Cf. Matt. xxii. 30.
[8] Cf. Luke xx. 36.

these. And, lastly, because "it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like God, and shall see Him as He is."[1] And if any one were to maintain what is asserted by some (either by those who possess intelligence or who do not, but have misconceived sound reason), that "God exists, and *we* are next to Him," I would interpret the word "we," by using in its stead, "We who act according to reason," or rather, "We *virtuous*, who act according to reason."[2] For, in our opinion, the same virtue belongs to *all* the blessed, so that the virtue of man and of God is identical.[3] And therefore we are taught to become "perfect," as our Father in heaven is perfect.[4] No good and virtuous man, then, is a "worm rolling in filth," nor is a pious man an "ant," nor a righteous man a "frog;" nor could one whose soul is enlightened with the bright light of truth be reasonably likened to a "bird of the night."

Chapter xxx.

It appears to me that Celsus has also misunderstood this statement, "Let us make man in our image and likeness;"[5] and has therefore represented the "worms" as saying that, being created by God, we altogether resemble Him. If, however, he had known the difference between man being created "in the image of God" and "after His likeness," and that God is recorded to have said, "Let us make man after our image and likeness," but that He made man "after the image" of God, but not then also "after His likeness,"[6] he would not have represented us as saying that "we are altogether like Him." Moreover, we do not assert that the stars are subject to us; since the resurrection which is called the "resurrection

[1] Cf. 1 John iii. 2.

[2] καὶ τοῦτό γ' ἂν ἑρμηνεύοιμι, τὸ "ἡμεῖς" λέγων ἀντὶ τοῦ οἱ λογικοὶ, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον, οἱ σπουδαῖοι λογικοί.

[3] ὥστε καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἀρετὴ ἀνθρώπου καὶ Θεοῦ. Cf. Cicero, *de leg.* i.: "Jam vero virtus eadem in homine ac deo est, neque ullo alio in genio præterea. Est autem virtus nihil aliud, quam in se perfecta, et ad summum perducta natura. Est igitur homini cum Deo similitudo." Cf. also Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vii.: Οὐ γὰρ, καθάπερ οἱ Στωϊκοὶ, ἀθέως, πάνυ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρετὴν ἀνθρωπου λέγομεν καὶ Θεοῦ. Cf. Theodoret, *Serm.* xi.—Spencer.

[4] Cf. Matt. v. 48. [5] Cf. Gen. i. 26. [6] Cf. Gen. i. 27.

of the just," and which is understood by wise men, is compared to the sun, and moon, and stars, by him who said, "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead."[1] Daniel also prophesied long ago regarding these things.[2] Celsus says further, that we assert that "all things have been arranged so as to be subject to us," having perhaps heard some of the intelligent among us speaking to that effect, and perhaps also not understanding the saying, that "he who is the greatest amongst us is the servant of all."[3] And if the Greeks say, "Then sun and moon are the slaves of mortal men,"[4] they express approval of the statement, and give an explanation of its meaning; but since such a statement is either not made at all by us, or is expressed in a different way, Celsus here too falsely accuses us. Moreover, we who, according to Celsus, are "worms," are represented by him as saying that, "seeing some among us are guilty of sin, God will come to us, or will send His own Son, that He may consume the wicked, and that we other frogs may enjoy eternal life with Him." Observe how this venerable philosopher, like a low buffoon,[5] turns into ridicule and mockery, and a subject of laughter, the announcement of a divine judgment, and of the punishment of the wicked, and of the reward of the righteous; and subjoins to all this the remark, that "such statements would be more endurable if made by worms and frogs than by Christians and Jews who quarrel with one another!" We shall not, however, imitate his example, nor say similar things regarding those philosophers who profess to know the nature of all things, and who discuss with each other the manner in which all things were created, and how the heaven and earth originated, and all things in them; and how the souls [of men], being either unbegotten, and not created by God, are yet governed by Him, and pass from one body to another;[6] or being formed at the same time with the body, exist for ever or pass away. For instead of treating with respect and accepting the intention of those who have devoted themselves to the investigation of the

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42. [2] Cf. Dan. xii. 3. [3] Cf. Matt. xx. 28.
[4] Cf. Eurip. *Phœniss.* 512. [5] βωμολόχος. [6] καὶ ἀμείβουσι σώματα.

truth, one might mockingly and revilingly say that such men were "worms," who did not measure themselves by their corner of their dung-heap in human life, and who accordingly gave forth their opinions on matters of such importance as if they understood them, and who strenuously assert that they have obtained a view of those things which cannot be seen without a higher inspiration and a diviner power. "For no man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him: even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."[1] We are not, however, mad, nor do we compare such human wisdom (I use the word "wisdom" in the common acceptation), which busies itself not about the affairs of the multitude, but in the investigation of truth, to the wrigglings of worms or any other such creatures; but in the spirit of truth, we testify of certain Greek philosophers that they knew God, seeing "He manifested Himself to them,"[2] although "they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations; and professing themselves to be wise, they became foolish, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."[3]

Chapter xxxi.

After this, wishing to prove that there is no difference between Jews and Christians, and those animals previously enumerated by him, he asserts that the Jews were "fugitives from Egypt, who never performed anything worthy of note, and never were held in any reputation or account."[4] Now, on the point of their not being fugitives, nor Egyptians, but Hebrews who settled in Egypt, we have spoken in the preceding pages. But if he thinks his statement, that "they were never held in any reputation or account," to be proved, because no remarkable event in their history is found recorded by the Greeks, we would answer, that if one will examine their polity from its first beginning, and the arrangement of their laws, he will find that they were men who represented upon earth the shadow of a heavenly life, and that amongst them

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 11. [2] Cf. Rom. i. 19. [3] Rom. i. 21–23.

[4] οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ αὐτοὺς πότε γεγενημένους.

God is recognised as nothing else, save He who is over all things, and that amongst them no maker of images was permitted to enjoy the rights of citizenship.[1] For neither painter nor image-maker existed in their state, the law expelling all such from it; that there might be no pretext for the construction of images,—an art which attracts the attention of foolish men, and which drags down the eyes of the soul from God to earth. There was, accordingly, amongst them a law to the following effect: "Do not transgress the law, and make to yourselves a graven image, any likeness of male or female; either a likeness of any one of the creatures that are upon the earth, or a likeness of any winged fowl that flieth under the heaven, or a likeness of any creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, or a likeness of any of the fishes which are in the waters under the earth."[2] The law, indeed, wished them to have regard to the truth of each individual thing, and not to form representations of things contrary to reality, feigning the appearance merely of what was really male or really female, or the nature of animals, or of birds, or of creeping things, or of fishes. Venerable, too, and grand was this prohibition of theirs: "Lift not up thine eyes unto heaven, lest, when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and all the host of heaven, thou shouldst be led astray to worship them, and serve them."[3] And what a *régime*[4] was that under which the whole nation was placed, and which rendered it impossible for any effeminate person to appear in public;[5] and worthy of admiration, too, was the arrangement by which harlots were removed out of the state, those incentives to the passions of the youth! Their courts of justice also were composed of men of the strictest integrity, who, after having for a lengthened period set the example of an unstained life, were entrusted with the duty of presiding over the tribunals, and who, on account of the superhuman purity of their character,[6] were said to be gods, in conformity with an ancient Jewish usage of speech. Here was the spectacle of a whole nation devoted to philosophy; and in order that there might be leisure to listen to their sacred

[1] ἐπολιτεύετο. [2] Cf. Deut. iv. 16–18. [3] Cf. Deut. iv. 19.
[4] πολιτεια. [5] οὐδὲ φαίνεσθαι θηλυδρίαν οἷον τ' ἦν.
[6] οἵ τινες διὰ τὸ καθαρὸν ἦθος, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον.

laws, the days termed "Sabbath," and the other festivals which existed among them, were instituted. And why need I speak of the orders of their priests and sacrifices, which contain innumerable indications [of deeper truths] to those who wish to ascertain the signification of things?

Chapter xxxii.

But since nothing belonging to human nature is permanent, this polity also must gradually be corrupted and changed. And Providence, having remodelled their venerable system where it needed to be changed, so as to adapt it to men of all countries, gave to believers of all nations, in place of the Jews, the venerable religion of Jesus, who, being adorned not only with understanding, but also with a share of divinity,[1] and having overthrown the doctrine regarding earthly demons, who delight in frankincense, and blood, and in the exhalations of sacrificial odours, and who, like the fabled Titans or Giants, drag down men from thoughts of God; and having Himself disregarded their plots, directed chiefly against the better class of men, enacted laws which ensure happiness to those who live according to them, and who do not flatter the demons by means of sacrifices, but altogether despise them, through help of the word of God, which aids those who look upwards to Him. And as it was the will of God that the doctrine of Jesus should prevail amongst men, the demons could effect nothing, although straining every nerve[2] to accomplish the destruction of Christians; for they stirred up both princes, and senates, and rulers in every place,—nay, even nations themselves, who did not perceive the irrational and wicked procedure of the demons,—against the word, and those who believed in it; yet, notwithstanding, the word of God, which is more powerful than all other things, even when meeting with opposition, deriving from the opposition, as it were, a means of increase, advanced onwards, and won many souls, such being the will of God. And we have offered these remarks by way of a necessary digression. For we wished to answer the assertion of Celsus concerning the Jews, that they were "fugitives from Egypt, and that these men, beloved by God, never accomplished anything worthy of

[1] θείᾳ μοίρᾳ. [2] καίτοιγε πάντα κάλων κινήσαντες.

note." And further, in answer to the statement that "they were never held in any reputation or account," we say, that living apart as a "chosen nation and a royal priesthood," and shunning intercourse with the many nations around them, in order that their morals might escape corruption, they enjoyed the protection of the divine power, neither coveting like the most of mankind the acquisition of other kingdoms, nor yet being abandoned so as to become, on account of their smallness, an easy object of attack to others, and thus be altogether destroyed; and this lasted so long as they were worthy of the divine protection. But when it became necessary for them, as a nation wholly given to sin, to be brought back by their sufferings to their God, they were abandoned [by Him], sometimes for a longer, sometimes for a shorter period, until in the time of the Romans, having committed the greatest of sins in putting Jesus to death, they were completely deserted.

Chapter xxxiii.

Immediately after this, Celsus, assailing the contents of the first book of Moses, which is entitled "Genesis," asserts that "the Jews accordingly endeavoured to derive their origin from the first race of jugglers and deceivers,[1] appealing to the testimony of dark and ambiguous words, whose meaning was veiled in obscurity, and which they misinterpreted[2] to the unlearned and ignorant, and that, too, when such a point had never been called in question during the long preceding period." Now Celsus appears to me in these words to have expressed very obscurely the meaning which he intended to convey. It is probable, indeed, that his obscurity on this subject is intentional, inasmuch as he saw the strength of the argument which establishes the descent of the Jews from their ancestors; while again, on the other hand, he wished not to appear ignorant that the question regarding the Jews and their descent was one that could not be lightly disposed of. It is certain, however, that the Jews trace their genealogy back to the three fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And the names of these individuals possess such efficacy, when united with the name of God, that not

[1] ἀπὸ πρώτης σποράς γοήτων καὶ πλάνων ἀνθρώπων.

[2] παρεξηγούμενοι.

only do those belonging to the nation employ in their prayers to God, and in the exorcising of demons, the words, "God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob," but so also do almost all those who occupy themselves with incantations and magical rites. For there is found in treatises on magic in many countries such an invocation of God, and assumption of the divine name, as implies a familiar use of it by these men in their dealings with demons. These facts, then—adduced by Jews and Christians to prove the sacred character of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, the fathers of the Jewish race—appear to me not to have been altogether unknown to Celsus, but not to have been distinctly set forth by him, because he was unable to answer the argument which might be founded on them.

Chapter xxxiv.

For we inquire of all those who employ such invocations of God, saying: Tell us, friends, who was Abraham, and what sort of person was Isaac, and what power did Jacob possess, that the appellation "God," when joined with their name, could effect such wonders? And from whom have you learned, or can you learn, the facts relating to these individuals? And who has occupied himself with writing a history about them, either directly magnifying these men by ascribing to them mysterious powers, or hinting obscurely at their possession of certain great and marvellous qualities, patent to those who are qualified to see them?[1] And when, in answer to our inquiry, no one can show from what history—whether Greek or barbarian—or, if not a history, yet at least from what mystical narrative,[2] the accounts of these men are derived, we shall bring forward the book entitled "Genesis," which contains the acts of these men, and the divine oracles addressed to them, and will say, Does not the use by you of the names of these three ancestors of the race, establishing in the clearest manner that effects not to be lightly regarded are produced by the invocation of them,

[1] εἴτε καὶ αὐτόθεν σεμνύνουσαν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τοὺς ἄνδρας, εἴτε καὶ δι' ὑπονοιῶν αἰνισσομένην τινὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμάσια τοῖς θεωρῆσαι αὐτὰ δυναμένοις.

[2] μυστικῆς ἀναγραφῆς.

evidence the divinity of the men?[1] And yet we know them from no other source than the sacred books of the Jews! Moreover, the phrases, "the God of Israel," and "the God of the Hebrews," and "the God who drowned in the Red Sea the king of Egypt and the Egyptians," are *formulæ* frequently employed against demons and certain wicked powers. And we learn the history of the names and their interpretation from those Hebrews, who in their national literature and national tongue dwell with pride upon these things, and explain their meaning. How, then, should the Jews attempt to derive their origin from the first race of those whom Celsus supposed to be jugglers and deceivers, and shamelessly endeavour to trace themselves and their beginning back to these?—whose names, being Hebrew, are an evidence to the Hebrews, who have their sacred books written in the Hebrew language and letters, that their nation is akin to these men. For up to the present time, the Jewish names belonging to the Hebrew language were either taken from their writings, or generally from words the meaning of which was made known by the Hebrew language.

Chapter xxxv.

And let any one who peruses the treatise of Celsus observe whether it does not convey some such insinuation as the above, when he says: "And they attempted to derive their origin from the first race of jugglers and deceivers, appealing to the testimony of dark and ambiguous words, whose meaning was veiled in obscurity." For these names are indeed obscure, and not within the comprehension and knowledge of many, though not in our opinion of doubtful meaning, even although assumed by those who are aliens to our religion; but as, according to Celsus, they do not[2] convey any ambiguity, I am at a loss to know why he has rejected them. And yet, if he had wished honestly to overturn the genealogy which he deemed the Jews to have so shamelessly arrogated, in boasting of Abraham and his

[1] ἐροῦμεν τὲ ὅτι μήποτε τὸ καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν παραλαμβάνεσθαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν τριῶν τούτων γεναρχῶν τοῦ ἔθνους, τῇ ἐναργείᾳ καταλαμβανόντων, οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητα ἀνύεσθαι ἐκ τῆς κατεπικλήσεως αὐτῶν, παρίστησι τὸ θεῖον τῶν ἀνδρῶν; Guietus would expunge the words τῇ ἐναργείᾳ καταλαμβανόντων.

[2] κατὰ δὲ Κελσον, οὐ παριστάντα. *Libri editi ad oram* ὡς παριστάντα.

descendants [as their progenitors], he ought to have quoted *all* the passages bearing on the subject; and, in the first place, to have advocated his cause with such arguments as he thought likely to be convincing, and in the next to have bravely[1] refuted, by means of what appeared to him to be the true meaning, and by arguments in its favour, the errors existing on the subject. But neither Celsus nor any one else will be able, by their discussions regarding the nature of names employed for miraculous purposes, to lay down the correct doctrine regarding them, and to demonstrate that those men were to be lightly esteemed whose names merely, not among their countrymen alone, but also amongst foreigners, could accomplish [such results]. He ought to have shown, moreover, how we, in misinterpreting[2] the passages in which these names are found, deceive our hearers, as he imagines, while he himself, who boasts that he is not ignorant or unintelligent, gives the true interpretation of them. And he hazarded the assertion,[3] in speaking of those names, from which the Jews deduce their genealogies, that "never, during the long antecedent period, has there been any dispute about these names, but that at the present time the Jews dispute about them with certain others," whom he does not mention. Now, let him who chooses show who these are that dispute with the Jews, and who adduce even probable arguments to show that Jews and Christians do not decide correctly on the points relating to these names, but that there are others who have discussed these questions with the greatest learning and accuracy. But we are well assured that none can establish anything of the sort, it being manifest that these names are derived from the Hebrew language, which is found only among the Jews.

Chapter xxxvi.

Celsus in the next place, producing from history other than that of the divine record, those passages which bear upon the claims to great antiquity put forth by many nations, as the Athenians, and Egyptians, and Arcadians, and Phrygians, who assert that certain individuals have existed among them who sprang from the earth, and who each adduce proofs of these

[1] γενναίως. [2] παρεξηγούμενοι. [3] παρέρριψε.

assertions, says: "The Jews, then, leading a grovelling life[1] in some corner of Palestine, and being a wholly uneducated people, who had not heard that these matters had been committed to verse long ago by Hesiod and innumerable other inspired men, wove together some most incredible and insipid stories,[2] viz. that a certain man was formed by the hands of God, and had breathed into him the breath of life, and that a woman was taken from his side, and that God issued certain commands, and that a serpent opposed these, and gained a victory over the commandments of God; thus relating certain old wives' fables, and most impiously representing God as weak at the very beginning [of things], and unable to convince even a single human being whom He Himself had formed." By these instances, indeed, this deeply read and learned Celsus, who accuses Jews and Christians of ignorance and want of instruction, clearly evinces the accuracy of his knowledge of the chronology of the respective historians, whether Greek or Barbarian, since he imagines that Hesiod and the "innumerable" others, whom he styles "inspired" men, are older than Moses and his writings—that very Moses who is shown to be much older than the time of the Trojan war! It is not the Jews, then, who have composed incredible and insipid stories regarding the birth of man from the earth, but these "inspired" men of Celsus, Hesiod and his other "innumerable" companions, who, having neither learned nor heard of the far older and most venerable accounts existing in Palestine, have written such histories as their Theogonies, attributing, so far as in their power, "generation" to their deities, and innumerable other absurdities. And these are the writers whom Plato expels from his "State" as being corrupters of the youth,[3]—Homer, viz., and those who have composed poems of a similar description! Now it is evident that Plato did not regard as "inspired" those men who had left behind them such works. But perhaps it was from a desire to cast reproach upon us, that this Epicurean Celsus, who is better able to judge than Plato (if it be the same Celsus who composed two other books against the Christians), called those individuals "inspired" whom he did not in reality regard as such.

[1] συγκύψαντες. [2] ἀμουσότατα. [3] Cf. Plato, *de Repub.* Book ii. etc.

Chapter xxxvii.

He charges us, moreover, with introducing "a man formed by the *hands* of God," although the book of Genesis has made no mention of the "hands" of God, either when relating the creation or the "fashioning"[1] of the man; while it is Job and David who have used the expression, "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me;"[2] with reference to which it would need a lengthened discourse to point out the sense in which these words were understood by those who used them, both as regards the difference between "making" and "fashioning," and also the "hands" of God. For those who do not understand these and similar expressions in the sacred Scriptures, imagine that we attribute to the God who is over all things a form[3] such as that of man; and according to their conceptions, it follows that we consider the body of God to be furnished with wings, since the Scriptures, literally understood, attribute such appendages to God. The subject before us, however, does not require us to interpret these expressions; for, in our explanatory remarks upon the book of Genesis, these matters have been made, to the best of our ability, a special subject of investigation. Observe next the malignity[4] of Celsus in what follows. For the Scripture, speaking of the "fashioning"[5] of the man, says, "And breathed into his face the breath of life, and the man became a living soul."[6] Whereon Celsus, wishing maliciously to ridicule the "inbreathing into his face of the breath of life," and not understanding the sense in which the expression was employed, states that "they composed a story that a man was fashioned by the hands of God, and was inflated by breath blown into him,"[7] in order that, taking the word "inflated" to be used in a similar way to the inflation of skins, he might ridicule the statement, "He breathed into his face the breath of life,"—terms which are used figuratively, and require to be explained in order to show that God com-

[1] ἐπὶ τῆς πλάσεως.
[2] Cf. Job x. 8 and Ps. cxix. 73.
[3] σχῆμα.
[4] κακοήθειαν.
[5] πλάσεως.
[6] Gen. ii. 7; Heb. בְּאַפָּיו, LXX. πρόσωπον.
[7] ἐμφυσώμενον.

municated to man of His incorruptible Spirit; as it is said, "For Thine incorruptible Spirit is in all things."[1]

Chapter xxxviii.

In the next place, as it is his object to slander our Scriptures, he ridicules the following statement: "And God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which He had taken from the man, made He a woman,"[2] and so on; without quoting the words, which would give the hearer the impression that they are spoken with a figurative meaning. He would not even have it appear that the words were used allegorically, although he says afterwards, that "the more modest among Jews and Christians are ashamed of these things, and endeavour to give them somehow an allegorical signification." Now we might say to him, Are the statements of your "inspired" Hesiod, which he makes regarding the woman in the form of a myth, to be explained allegorically, in the sense that she was given by Jove to men as an evil thing, and as a retribution for the theft of "the fire;"[3] while that regarding the woman who was taken from the side of the man (after he had been buried in deep slumber), and was formed by God, appears to you to be related without any rational meaning and secret signification?[4] But is it not uncandid, not to ridicule the former as myths, but to admire them as philosophical ideas in a mythical dress, and to treat with contempt[5] the latter, as offending the understanding, and to declare that they are of no account? For if, because of the mere phraseology, we are to find fault with what is intended to have a secret meaning, see whether the following lines of Hesiod, a man, as you say, "inspired," are not better fitted to excite laughter:

> "'Son of Iapetus!' with wrathful heart,
> Spake the cloud-gatherer: 'Oh, unmatched in art!
> Exultest thou in this the flame retrieved,
> And dost thou triumph in the God deceived?
> But thou, with the posterity of man,
> Shalt rue the fraud whence mightier ills began;

---

[1] Wisd. of Solom. xii. 1. [2] Cf. Gen. ii. 21, 22. [3] ἀντὶ τοῦ πυρός.
[4] χωρὶς παντὸς λόγου καί τινος ἐπικρύψεως. [5] μοχθίζειν.

I will send evil for thy stealthy fire,
While all embrace it, and their bane desire.'
The sire, who rules the earth, and sways the pole,
Had said, and laughter fill'd his secret soul.
He bade the artist-god his hest obey,
And mould with tempering waters ductile clay:
Infuse, as breathing life and form began,
The supple vigour, and the voice of man:
Her aspect fair as goddesses above,
A virgin's likeness, with the brows of love.
He bade Minerva teach the skill that dyes
The web with colours, as the shuttle flies;
He called the magic of Love's Queen to shed
A nameless grace around her courteous head;
Instil the wish that longs with restless aim,
And cares of dress that feed upon the frame:
Bade Hermes last implant the craft refined
Of artful manners, and a shameless mind.
He said; their king th' inferior powers obeyed:
The fictile likeness of a bashful maid
Rose from the temper'd earth, by Jove's behest,
Under the forming God; the zone and vest
Were clasp'd and folded by Minerva's hand:
The heaven-born graces, and persuasion bland
Deck'd her round limbs with chains of gold: the hours
Of loose locks twined her temples with spring flowers.
The whole attire Minerva's curious care
Form'd to her shape, and fitted to her air.
But in her breast the herald from above,
Full of the counsels of deep thundering Jove,
Wrought artful manners, wrought perfidious lies,
And speech that thrills the blood, and lulls the wise.
Her did th' interpreter of Gods proclaim,
And named the woman with Pandora's name;
Since all the gods conferr'd their gifts, to charm,
For man's inventive race, this beauteous harm."[1]

Moreover, what is said also about the casket is fitted of itself to excite laughter; for example:

"Whilome on earth the sons of men abode
From ills apart, and labour's irksome load,
And sore diseases, bringing age to man;
Now the sad life of mortals is a span.

[1] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, i. v. 73–114 (Elton's translation).

The woman's hands a mighty casket bear;
She lifts the lid; she scatters griefs in air:
Alone, beneath the vessels' rims detained,
Hope still within th' unbroken cell remained,
Nor fled abroad; so will'd cloud-gatherer Jove:
The woman's hand had dropp'd the lid above."[1]

Now, to him who would give to these lines a grave allegorical meaning (whether any such meaning be contained in them or not), we would say: Are the Greeks alone at liberty to convey a philosophic meaning in a secret covering? or perhaps also the Egyptians, and those of the barbarians who pride themselves upon their mysteries and the truth [which is concealed within them]; while the Jews alone, with their lawgiver and historians, appear to you the most unintelligent of men? And is this the only nation which has not received a share of divine power, and which yet was so grandly instructed how to rise upwards to the uncreated nature of God, and to gaze on Him alone, and to expect from Him alone [the fulfilment of] their hopes?

Chapter xxxix.

But as Celsus makes a jest also of the serpent, as counteracting the injunctions given by God to the man, taking the narrative to be an old wife's fable,[2] and has purposely neither mentioned the paradise[3] of God, nor stated that God is said to have planted it in Eden towards the east, and that there afterwards sprang up from the earth every tree that was beautiful to the sight, and good for food, and the tree of life in the midst of the paradise, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the other statements which follow, which might of themselves lead a candid reader to see that all these things had not inappropriately an allegorical meaning, let us contrast with this the words of Socrates regarding Eros in the Symposium of Plato, and which are put in the mouth of Socrates as being more appropriate than what was said regarding him by all the others at the Symposium. The words of Plato are as

[1] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, i. v. 125–134 (Elton's translation).
[2] "μῦθόν τινα" παραπλήσιον τοῖς παραδιδομένοις ταῖς γραυσίν.
[3] παράδεισος.

follow: "When Aphrodite was born, the gods held a banquet, and there was present, along with the others, Porus the son of Metis. And after they had dined, Penia[1] came to beg for something (seeing there was an entertainment), and she stood at the gate. Porus meantime, having become intoxicated with the nectar (for there was then no wine), went into the garden of Zeus, and being heavy with liquor, lay down to sleep. Penia accordingly formed a secret plot, with a view of freeing herself from her condition of poverty,[2] to get a child by Porus, and accordingly lay down beside him, and became pregnant with Eros. And on this account Eros has become the follower and attendant of Aphrodite, having been begotten on her birthday feast,[3] and being at the same time by nature a lover of the beautiful, because Aphrodite too is beautiful. Seeing, then, that Eros is the son of Porus and Penia, the following is his condition.[4] In the first place, he is always poor, and far from being delicate and beautiful, as most persons imagine; but is withered, and sunburnt,[5] and unshod, and without a home, sleeping always upon the ground, and without a covering; lying in the open air beside gates, and on public roads; possessing the nature of his mother, and dwelling continually with indigence.[6] But, on the other hand, in conformity with the character of his father, he is given to plotting against the beautiful and the good, being courageous, and hasty, and vehement;[7] a keen[8] hunter, perpetually devising contrivances; both much given to forethought, and also fertile in resources;[9] acting like a philosopher throughout the whole of his life; a terrible[10] sorcerer, and dealer in drugs, and a sophist as well; neither immortal by nature nor yet mortal, but on the same day, at one time he flourishes and lives when he has plenty, and again at another time dies, and once more is recalled to life through possessing the nature of his father. But the supplies furnished to him are always gradually disappearing, so that he is never at any time in want, nor yet rich; and, on the other hand, he occupies an intermediate position between wis-

[1] Penia, poverty; Porus, abundance. [2] διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ἀπορίαν.
[3] ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνης γενέθλιοις. [4] ἐν τοιαύτῃ τύχῃ καθέστηκε.
[5] σκληρὸς καὶ αὐχμηρός. [6] ἐνδείᾳ. [7] σύντονος.
[8] δεινός. [9] καὶ φρονήσεως ἐπιθυμητὴς καὶ πόριμος. [10] δεινὸς γόης.

dom and ignorance." Now, if those who read these words were to imitate the malignity of Celsus—which be it far from Christians to do!—they would ridicule the myth, and would turn this great Plato into a subject of jest; but if, on investigating in a philosophic spirit what is conveyed in the dress of a myth, they should be able to discover the meaning of Plato, [they will admire][1] the manner in which he was able to conceal, on account of the multitude, in the form of this myth, the great ideas which presented themselves to him, and to speak in a befitting manner to those who know how to ascertain from the myths the true meaning of him who wove them together. Now I have brought forward this myth occurring in the writings of Plato, because of the mention in it of the garden of Zeus, which appears to bear some resemblance to the paradise of God, and of the comparison between Penia and the serpent, and the plot against Porus by Penia, which may be compared with the plot of the serpent against the man. It is not very clear, indeed, whether Plato fell in with these stories by chance, or whether, as some think, meeting during his visit to Egypt with certain individuals who philosophized on the Jewish mysteries, and learning some things from them, he may have preserved a few of their ideas, and thrown others aside, being careful not to offend the Greeks by a complete adoption of all the points of the philosophy of the Jews, who were in bad repute with the multitude, on account of the foreign character of their laws and their peculiar polity. The present, however, is not the proper time for explaining either the myth of Plato, or the story of the serpent and the paradise of God, and all that is related to have taken place in it, as in our exposition of the book of Genesis we have especially occupied ourselves as we best could with these matters.

Chapter xl.

But as he asserts that "the Mosaic narrative most impiously represents God as in a state of weakness from the very commencement [of things], and as unable to gain over [to obedience] even one single man whom He Himself had formed,"

[1] Boherellus, quem Ruæus sequitur, in notis; "Ante voces: τίνα τρόπον, videtur deesse: θαυμάσονται, aut quid simile."—Lommatzsch.

we say in answer that the objection[1] is much the same as if one were to find fault with the existence of evil, which God has not been able to prevent even in the case of a single individual, so that *one* man might be found from the very beginning of things who was born into the world untainted by sin. For as those whose business it is to defend the doctrine of providence do so by means of arguments which are not to be despised,[2] so also the subjects of Adam and his son will be philosophically dealt with by those who are aware that in the Hebrew language Adam signifies man; and that in those parts of the narrative which appear to refer to Adam as an individual, Moses is discoursing upon the nature of man in general.[3] For "in Adam" (as the Scripture[4] says) "all die," and were condemned in the likeness of Adam's transgression, the word of God asserting this not so much of *one particular individual* as of the *whole human race.* For in the connected series of statements which appears to apply as to one particular individual, the curse pronounced upon Adam is regarded as common to all [the members of the race], and what was spoken with reference to the woman is spoken of *every* woman without exception.[5] And the expulsion of the man and woman from paradise, and their being clothed with tunics of skins (which God, because of the transgression of men, made for those who had sinned), contain a certain secret and mystical doctrine (far transcending that of Plato) of the soul's losing its wings,[6] and being borne downwards to earth, until it can lay hold of some stable resting-place.

Chapter xli.

After this he continues as follows: "They speak, in the next place, of a deluge, and of a monstrous[7] ark, having within it all things, and of a dove and a crow[8] as messengers, falsifying and recklessly altering[9] the story of Deucalion; not ex-

[1] τὸ λεγόμενον.
[2] εὐκαταφρονήτων.
[3] Φυσιολογεῖ Μωϋσῆς τὰ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22 with Rom. v. 14.
[5] οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ἧς οὐ λέγεται.
[6] πτεροῤῥυούσης. This is a correction for πτεροφυούσης, the textual reading in the Benedictine and Spencer's edd.
[7] ἀλλόκοτον.
[8] κορώνη.
[9] παραχαράττοντες καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες.

pecting, I suppose, that these things would come to light, but imagining that they were inventing stories merely for young children." Now in these remarks observe the hostility—so unbecoming a philosopher—displayed by this man towards this very ancient Jewish narrative. For, not being able to say anything against the history of the deluge, and not perceiving what he might have urged against the ark and its dimensions,—viz. that, according to the general opinion, which accepted the statements that it was three hundred cubits in length, and fifty in breadth, and thirty in height, it was impossible to maintain that it contained [all] the animals that were upon the earth, fourteen specimens of every clean and four of every unclean beast,—he merely termed it "monstrous, containing all things within it." Now wherein was its "monstrous" character, seeing it is related to have been a hundred years in building, and to have had the three hundred cubits of its length and the fifty of its breadth contracted, until the thirty cubits of its height terminated in a top one cubit long and one cubit broad? Why should we not rather admire a structure which resembled an extensive city, if its measurements be taken to mean what they are capable of meaning,[1] so that it was nine myriads of cubits long in the base, and two thousand five hundred in breadth? And why should we not admire the design evinced in having it so compactly built, and rendered capable of sustaining a tempest which caused a deluge? For it was not daubed with pitch, or any material of that kind, but was securely coated with bitumen. And is it not a subject of admiration, that by the providential arrangement of God, the elements of all the races were brought into it, that the earth might receive again the seeds of all living things, while God made use of a most righteous man to be the progenitor of those who were to be born after the deluge?

Chapter xlii.

In order to show that he had read the book of Genesis, Celsus rejects the story of the dove, although unable to adduce any reason which might prove it to be a fiction. In the next place, as his habit is, in order to put the narrative in a more ridiculous

[1] τῷ δυνάμει λέγεσθαι τὰ μέτρα.

light, he converts the "raven" into a "crow," and imagines that Moses so wrote, having recklessly altered the accounts related of the Grecian Deucalion; unless perhaps he regards the narrative as not having proceeded from Moses, but from *several* individuals, as appears from his employing the *plural* number in the expressions, "falsifying and recklessly altering the story of Deucalion,"[1] as well as from the words, "For *they* did not expect, I suppose, that these things would come to light." But how should they, who gave their Scriptures to the *whole* nation, not expect that they would come to light, and who predicted, moreover, that this religion should be proclaimed to *all* nations? Jesus declared, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof;"[2] and in uttering these words to the Jews, what other meaning did He intend to convey than this, viz. that He Himself should, through His divine power, bring forth into light the whole of the Jewish Scriptures, which contain the mysteries of the kingdom of God? If, then, they peruse the Theogonies of the Greeks, and the stories about the twelve gods, they impart to them an air of dignity, by investing them with an allegorical signification; but when they wish to throw contempt upon our biblical narratives, they assert that they are fables, clumsily invented for infant children!

Chapter xliii.

"Altogether absurd, and out of season,"[3] he continues, "is the [account of the] begetting of children," where, although he has mentioned no names, it is evident that he is referring to the history of Abraham and Sarah. Cavilling also at the "conspiracies of the brothers," he alludes either to the story of Cain plotting against Abel,[4] or, in addition, to that of Esau against Jacob;[5] and [speaking] of "a father's sorrow," he probably refers to that of Isaac on account of the absence of Jacob, and perhaps also to that of Jacob because of Joseph having been sold into Egypt. And when relating the "crafty procedure of mothers," I suppose he means the conduct of Rebecca, who contrived that the blessing of Isaac should descend, not upon

[1] παραχαράττοντες καὶ ῥᾳδιουργοῦντες.
[2] Cf. Matt. xxi. 43.
[3] ἔξωρον.
[4] Cf. Gen. iv. 8.
[5] Cf. Gen. xxi. 2.

Esau, but upon Jacob. Now if we assert that in all these cases God interposed in a very marked degree,[1] what absurdity do we commit, seeing we are persuaded that He never withdraws His providence[2] from those who devote themselves to Him in an honourable and vigorous[3] life? He ridicules, moreover, the acquisition of property made by Jacob while living with Laban, not understanding to what these words refer: "And those which had no spots were Laban's, and those which were spotted were Jacob's;"[4] and he says that "God presented his sons with asses, and sheep, and camels,"[5] and did not see that "all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and were written for our sake, upon whom the ends of the world are come."[6] The varying customs [prevailing among the different nations] becoming famous,[7] are regulated by the word of God, being given as a possession to him who is figuratively termed Jacob. For those who become converts to Christ from among the heathen, are indicated by the history of Laban and Jacob.

Chapter xliv.

And erring widely from the meaning of Scripture, he says that "God gave wells[8] also to the righteous." Now he did not observe that the righteous do not construct cisterns,[9] but dig wells, seeking to discover the inherent ground and source of potable blessings,[10] inasmuch as they receive in a figurative sense the commandment which enjoins, "Drink waters from your own vessels, and from your own wells of fresh water. Let not your water be poured out beyond your own fountain,

[1] ἀγχιστα δὲ τούτοις πᾶσι συμπολιτεύομενον. [2] θειότητα.

[3] ἐῤῥωμένως.

[4] Cf. Gen. xxx. 42 (LXX.). "The feebler were Laban's, and the stronger Jacob's" (Auth. Vers.).

[5] Cf. Gen. xxx. 43.

[6] Cf. 1 Cor. x. 11.

[7] παρ' οἷς τὰ ποικίλα ἤθη ἐπίσημα γενόμενα, τῷ λογῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ πολιτεύεται, δυθέντα κτῆσις τῷ τροπικῶς καλουμένῳ Ἰακώβ: ἐπίσημα is the term employed to denote the "spotted" cattle of Laban, and is here used by Origen in its figurative sense of "distinguished," thus playing on the double meaning of the word.

[8] φρέατα. [9] λάκκους.

[10] τὴν ἐνυπάρχουσαν γῆν καὶ ἀρχὴν τῶν ποτίμων ἀγαθῶν. Boherellus proposes: τὴν ἐνυπάρχουσαν πηγὴν καὶ ἀρχὴν τῶν ποτίμων ὑδάτων.

but let it pass into your own streets. Let it belong to you alone, and let no alien partake with thee."[1] Scripture frequently makes use of the histories of real events, in order to present to view more important truths, which are but obscurely intimated; and of this kind are the narratives relating to the "wells," and to the "marriages," and to the various acts of "sexual intercourse" recorded of righteous persons, respecting which, however, it will be more seasonable to offer an explanation in the exegetical writings referring to those very passages. But that wells were constructed by righteous men in the land of the Philistines, as related in the book of Genesis,[2] is manifest from the wonderful wells which are shown at Ascalon, and which are deserving of mention on account of their structure, so foreign and peculiar compared with that of other wells. Moreover, that both young women[3] and female servants are to be understood metaphorically, is not *our* doctrine merely, but one which we have received from the beginning from wise men, among whom a certain one said, when exhorting his hearers to investigate the figurative meaning: "Tell me, ye that read the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar."[4] And a little after, "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." And any one who will take up the Epistle to the Galatians may learn how the passages relating to the "marriages," and the intercourse with "the maid-servants," have been allegorized; the Scripture desiring us to imitate not the literal acts of those who did these things, but (as the apostles of Jesus are accustomed to call them) the spiritual.

Chapter xlv.

And whereas Celsus ought to have recognised the love of truth displayed by the writers of sacred Scripture, who have

[1] Cf. Prov. v. 15–17.
[2] Cf. Gen. xxvi. 15.
[3] *νύμφας.*
[4] Cf. Gal. iv. 21–24.

not concealed even what is to their discredit,[1] and thus been led to accept the other and more marvellous accounts as true, he has done the reverse, and has characterized the story of Lot and his daughters (without examining either its literal or its figurative meaning) as "worse than the crimes of Thyestes." The figurative signification of that passage of history it is not necessary at present to explain, nor what is meant by Sodom, and by the words of the angels to him who was escaping thence, when they said: "Look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the surrounding district; escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed;"[2] nor what is intended by Lot and his wife, who became a pillar of salt because she turned back; nor by his daughters intoxicating their father, that they might become mothers by him. But let us in a few words soften down the repulsive features of the history. The nature of actions—good, bad, and indifferent—has been investigated by the Greeks; and the more successful of such investigators[3] lay down the principle that intention alone gives to actions the character of good or bad, and that all things which are done without a purpose are, strictly speaking, indifferent; that when the intention is directed to a becoming end, it is praiseworthy; when the reverse, it is censurable. They have said, accordingly, in the section relating to "things indifferent," that, strictly speaking, for a man to have sexual intercourse with his daughters is a thing indifferent, although such a thing ought not to take place in established communities. And for the sake of hypothesis, in order to show that such an act belongs to the class of things indifferent, they have assumed the case of a wise man being left with an only daughter, the entire human race besides having perished; and they put the question whether the father can fitly have intercourse with his daughter, in order, agreeably to the supposition, to prevent the extermination of mankind. Is this to be accounted sound reasoning among the Greeks, and to be commended by the influential[4] sect of the Stoics; but when young maidens, who had heard of the burning of the world, though without comprehending [its full meaning], saw fire devastating their city and country, and supposing that

[1] τὰ ἀπεμφαίνοντα.

[2] Gen. xix. 17.

[3] οἱ ἐπιτυγχάνοντες γε αὐτῶν.

[4] οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος αὐτοῖς.

the only means left of rekindling the flame[1] of human life lay in their father and themselves, should, on such a supposition, conceive the desire that the world should continue, shall their conduct be deemed worse than that of the wise man who, according to the hypothesis of the Stoics, acts becomingly in having intercourse with his daughters in the case already supposed, of all men having been destroyed? I am not unaware, however, that some have taken offence at the desire[2] of Lot's daughters, and have regarded their conduct as very wicked; and have said that two accursed nations—Moab and Ammon—have sprung from that unhallowed intercourse. And yet truly sacred Scripture is nowhere found distinctly approving of their conduct as good, nor yet passing sentence upon it as blameworthy. Nevertheless, whatever be the real state of the case, it admits not only of a figurative meaning, but also of being defended on its own merits.[3]

Chapter xlvi.

Celsus, moreover, sneers at the "hatred" of Esau (to which, I suppose, he refers) against Jacob, although he was a man who, according to the Scriptures, is acknowledged to have been wicked; and not clearly stating the story of Simeon and Levi, who sallied out [on the Shechemites] on account of the insult offered to their sister, who had been violated by the son of the Shechemite king, he inveighs against their conduct. And passing on, he speaks of "brothers selling [one another]," alluding to the sons of Jacob; and of "a brother sold," Joseph to wit; and of "a father deceived," viz. Jacob, because he entertained no suspicion of his sons when they showed him Joseph's coat of many colours, but believed their statement, and mourned for his son, who was a slave in Egypt, as if he were dead. And observe in what a spirit of hatred and falsehood Celsus collects together the statements of the sacred history; so that wherever it appeared to him to contain a ground of accusation he produces the passage, but wherever there is any exhibition of virtue worthy of mention—as when Joseph would not gratify the lust of his mistress, refusing alike her allurements and her

[1] ζώπυρον. [2] βουλήματι.
[3] ἔχει δέ τινα καὶ καθ' αὑτὸ ἀπολογίαν.

threats—he does not even mention the circumstance! He should see, indeed, that the conduct of Joseph was far superior to what is related of Bellerophon,[1] since the former chose rather to be shut up in prison than do violence to his virtue. For although he might have offered a just defence against his accuser, he magnanimously remained silent, entrusting his cause to God.

Chapter xlvii.

Celsus next, for form's sake,[2] and with great want of precision, speaks of "the dreams of the chief butler and chief baker, and of Pharaoh, and of the explanation of them, in consequence of which Joseph was taken out of prison in order to be entrusted by Pharaoh with the second place in Egypt." What absurdity, then, did the history contain, looked at even in itself, that it should be adduced as matter of accusation by this Celsus, who gave the title of *True Discourse* to a treatise not containing doctrines, but full of charges against Jews and Christians? He adds: "He who had been sold behaved kindly to his brethren (who had sold him), when they were suffering from hunger, and had been sent with their asses to purchase [provisions];" although he has not related these occurrences [in his treatise]. But he *does* mention the circumstance of Joseph making himself known to his brethren, although I know not with what view, or what absurdity he can point out in such an occurrence; since it is impossible for Momus himself, we might say, to find any reasonable fault with events which, apart from their figurative meaning, present so much that is attractive. He relates, further, that "Joseph, who had been sold as a slave, was restored to liberty, and went up with a solemn procession to his father's funeral," and thinks that the narrative furnishes matter of accusation against us, as he makes the following remark: "By whom (Joseph, namely) the illustrious and divine nation of the Jews, after growing up in Egypt to be a multitude of people, was commanded to sojourn somewhere beyond the limits of the kingdom, and to pasture their flocks in districts of no repute." Now the words, "that they were commanded to pasture their flocks in districts of no repute,"

[1] Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 160.

[2] ὡσίας ἕνεκεν.

are an addition, proceeding from his own feelings of hatred; for he has not shown that Goshen, the district of Egypt, is a place of no repute. The exodus of the people from Egypt he calls a flight, not at all remembering what is written in the book of Exodus regarding the departure of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt. We have enumerated these instances to show that what, literally considered, might appear to furnish ground of accusation, Celsus has not succeeded in proving to be either objectionable or foolish, having utterly failed to establish the evil character, as he regards it, of our Scriptures.

Chapter xlviii.

In the next place, as if he had devoted himself solely to the manifestation of his hatred and dislike of the Jewish and Christian doctrine, he says: "The more modest of Jewish and Christian writers give all these things an allegorical meaning;" and, "Because they are ashamed of these things, they take refuge in allegory." Now one might say to him, that if we must admit fables and fictions, whether written with a concealed meaning or with any other object, to be shameful narratives when taken in their literal acceptation,[1] of what histories can this be said more truly than of the Grecian? In these histories, gods who are sons castrate the gods who are their fathers, and gods who are parents devour their own children, and a goddess-mother gives to the "father of gods and men" a stone to swallow instead of his own son, and a father has intercourse with his daughter, and a wife binds her own husband, having as her allies in the work the brother of the fettered god and his own daughter! But why should I enumerate these absurd stories of the Greeks regarding their gods, which are most shameful in themselves, even though invested with an allegorical meaning? [Take the instance] where Chrysippus of Soli, who is considered to be an ornament of the Stoic sect, on account of his numerous and learned treatises, explains a picture at Samos, in which Juno was represented as committing unspeakable abominations with Jupiter. This reverend philosopher says in his treatises, that matter receives the spermatic words[2] of the god, and retains them within herself, in order to

[1] κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἐκδοχήν. [2] τοὺς σπερματικοὺς λόγους.

ornament the universe. For in the picture at Samos Juno represents matter, and Jupiter God. Now it is on account of these, and of countless other similar fables, that we would not even in word call the God of all things Jupiter, or the sun Apollo, or the moon Diana. But we offer to the Creator a worship which is pure, and speak with religious respect of His noble works of creation, not contaminating even in word the things of God; approving of the language of Plato in the *Philebus*, who would not admit that pleasure was a goddess, "so great is my reverence, Protarchus," he says, "for the very names of the gods." We verily entertain such reverence for the name of God, and for His noble works of creation, that we would not, even under pretext of an allegorical meaning, admit any fable which might do injury to the young.

Chapter xlix.

If Celsus had read the Scriptures in an impartial spirit, he would not have said that "our writings are incapable of admitting an allegorical meaning." For from the prophetic Scriptures, in which historical events are recorded (not from the historical), it is possible to be convinced that the historical portions also were written with an allegorical purpose, and were most skilfully adapted not only to the multitude of the simpler believers, but also to the few who are able or willing to investigate matters in an intelligent spirit. If, indeed, those writers at the present day who are deemed by Celsus the "more modest of the Jews and Christians" were the [first] allegorical interpreters of our Scriptures, he would have the appearance, perhaps, of making a plausible allegation. But since the very fathers and authors of the doctrines themselves give them an allegorical signification, what other inference can be drawn than that they were composed so as to be allegorically understood in their chief signification?[1] And we shall adduce a few instances out of very many to show that Celsus brings an empty charge against the Scriptures, when he says "that they are incapable of admitting an allegorical meaning." Paul, the apostle of Jesus, says: "It is written in the law, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.

[1] κατὰ τὸν προηγούμενον νοῦν.

Doth God take care for oxen? or saith He it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written, that he that plougheth should plough in hope, and he that thresheth in hope of partaking."[1] And in another passage the same Paul says: "For it is written, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church."[2] And again, in another place: "We know that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea."[3] Then, explaining the history relating to the manna, and that referring to the miraculous issue of the water from the rock, he continues as follows: "And they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ."[4] Asaph, moreover, who, in showing the histories in Exodus and Numbers to be full of difficulties and parables,[5] begins in the following manner, as recorded in the book of Psalms, where he is about to make mention of these things: "Give ear, O my people, to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter dark sayings of old, which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us."[6]

Chapter l.

Moreover, if the law of Moses had contained nothing which was to be understood as having a secret meaning, the prophet would not have said in his prayer to God, "Open Thou mine eyes, and I will behold wondrous things out of Thy law;"[7] whereas he knew that there was a veil of ignorance lying upon the heart of those who read but do not understand the figurative meaning, which veil is taken away by the gift of God, when He hears him who has done all that he can,[8] and who by reason of habit has his senses exercised to distinguish between good

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10, and Deut. xxv. 4.
[2] Cf. Eph. v. 31, 32. Cf. Gen. ii. 24.
[3] Cf. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.
[5] προβλήματα καὶ παραβολαί.
[6] Cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 1, 2.
[7] Cf. Ps. cxix. 18.
[8] ἐπὰν ἐπακούσῃ τοῦ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ πάντα ποιήσαντος.

and evil, and who continually utters the prayer, "Open Thou mine eyes, and I will behold wondrous things out of Thy law." And who is there that, on reading of the dragon that lives in the Egyptian river,[1] and of the fishes which lurk in his scales, or of the excrement of Pharaoh which fills the mountains of Egypt,[2] is not led at once to inquire who he is that fills the Egyptian mountains with his stinking excrement, and what the Egyptian mountains are; and what the rivers in Egypt are, of which the aforesaid Pharaoh boastfully says, "The rivers are mine, and I have made them;"[3] and who the dragon is, and the fishes in its scales,—and this so as to harmonize with the interpretation to be given of the rivers? But why establish at greater length what needs no demonstration? For to these things applies the saying: "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? or who is prudent, and he shall know them?"[4] Now I have gone at some length into the subject, because I wished to show the unsoundness of the assertion of Celsus, that "the more modest among the Jews and Christians endeavour somehow to give these stories an allegorical signification, although some of them do not admit of this, but on the contrary are exceedingly silly inventions." Much rather are the stories of the Greeks not only very silly, but very impious inventions. For our narratives keep expressly in view the multitude of simpler believers, which was not done by those who invented the Grecian fables. And therefore not without propriety does Plato expel from his state all fables and poems of such a nature as those of which we have been speaking.

Chapter li.

Celsus appears to me to have heard that there are treatises in existence which contain allegorical explanations of the law of Moses. These, however, he could not have read; for if he had, he would not have said: "The allegorical explanations, however, which have been devised, are much more shameful and absurd than the fables themselves, inasmuch as they endeavour to unite with marvellous and altogether insensate folly things which cannot at all be made to harmonize." He seems

[1] Cf. Ezek. xxix. 3.
[2] Cf. Ezek. xxxii. 6.
[3] Cf. Ezek. xxix. 3.
[4] Cf. Hos. xiv. 9.

to refer in these words to the works of Philo, or to those of still older writers, such as Aristobulus. But I conjecture that Celsus has not read their books, since it appears to me that in many passages they have so successfully hit the meaning [of the sacred writers], that even Grecian philosophers would have been captivated by their explanations; for in their writings we find not only a polished style, but exquisite thoughts and doctrines, and a rational use of what Celsus imagines to be fables in the sacred writings. I know, moreover, that Numenius the Pythagorean—a surpassingly excellent expounder of Plato, and who held a foremost place as a teacher of the doctrines of Pythagoras—in many of his works quotes from the writings of Moses and the prophets, and applies to the passages in question a not improbable allegorical meaning, as in his work called *Epops*, and in those which treat of "Numbers" and of "Place." And in the third book of his dissertation on *The Good*, he quotes also a narrative regarding Jesus—without, however, mentioning His name—and gives it an allegorical signification, whether successfully or the reverse I may state on another occasion. He relates also the account respecting Moses, and Jannes, and Jambres.[1] But we are not elated on account of this instance, though we express our approval of Numenius, rather than of Celsus and other Greeks, because he was willing to investigate our histories from a desire to acquire knowledge, and was [duly] affected by them as narratives which were to be allegorically understood, and which did not belong to the category of foolish compositions.

Chapter lii.

After this, selecting from all the treatises which contain allegorical explanations and interpretations, expressed in a language and style not to be despised, the least important,[2] such as might contribute, indeed, to strengthen the faith of the multitude of simple believers, but were not adapted to impress those of more intelligent mind, he continues: "Of such a nature do I know the work to be, entitled *Controversy between one Papiscus and Jason*, which is fitted to excite pity and hatred instead of laughter. It is not my purpose, however, to confute

[1] Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[2] τὸ εὐτελέστερον.

the statements contained in such works; for their fallacy is manifest to all, especially if any one will have the patience to read the books themselves. Rather do I wish to show that Nature teaches this, that God made nothing that is mortal, but that His works, whatever they are, are immortal, and theirs mortal. And the soul[1] is the work of God, while the nature of the body is different. And in this respect there is no difference between the body of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog, and that of a man; for the matter[2] is the same, and their corruptible part is alike." Nevertheless I could wish that every one who heard Celsus declaiming and asserting that the treatise entitled *Controversy between Jason and Papiscus regarding Christ* was fitted to excite not laughter, but hatred, could take the work into his hands, and patiently listen to its contents; that, finding in it nothing to excite hatred, he might condemn Celsus out of the book itself. For if it be impartially perused, it will be found that there is nothing to excite even laughter in a work in which a Christian is described as conversing with a Jew on the subject of the Jewish Scriptures, and proving that the predictions regarding Christ fitly apply to Jesus; although the other disputant maintains the discussion in no ignoble style, and in a manner not unbecoming the character of a Jew.

Chapter liii.

I do not know, indeed, how he could conjoin things that do not admit of union, and which cannot exist together at the same time in human nature, in saying, as he did, that "the above treatise deserved to be treated both with pity and hatred." For every one will admit that he who is the object of pity is not at the same moment an object of hatred, and that he who is the object of hatred is not at the same time a subject of pity. Celsus, moreover, says that it was not his purpose to refute such statements, because he thinks that their absurdity is evident to all, and that, even before offering any logical refutation, they will appear to be bad, and to merit both pity and hatred. But we invite him who peruses this reply of ours to the charges of Celsus to have patience, and to listen to our sacred writings themselves, and, as far as possible, to form an opinion from

[1] ψυχή. [2] ὕλη.

their *contents* of the purpose of the writers, and of their consciences and disposition of mind; for he will discover that they are men who strenuously contend for what they uphold, and that some of them show that the history which they narrate is one which they have both seen and experienced,[1] which was miraculous, and worthy of being recorded for the advantage of their future hearers. Will any one indeed venture to say that it is not the source and fountain of all blessing[2] [to men] to believe in the God of all things, and to perform all our actions with the view of pleasing Him in everything whatever, and not to entertain even a thought unpleasing to Him, seeing that not only our words and deeds, but our very thoughts, will be the subject of future judgment? And what other arguments would more effectually lead human nature to adopt a virtuous life, than the belief or opinion that the supreme God beholds all things, not only what is said and done, but even what is thought by us? And let any one who likes compare any other system which at the same time converts and ameliorates, not merely one or two individuals, but, as far as in it lies, countless numbers, that by the comparison of both methods he may form a correct idea of the arguments which dispose to a virtuous life.

Chapter liv.

But as in the words which I quoted from Celsus, which are a paraphrase from the *Timæus*, certain expressions occur, such as, "God made nothing mortal, but immortal things alone, while mortal things are the works of others, and the soul is a work of God, but the nature of the body is different, and there is no difference between the body of a man and that of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog; for the matter is the same, and their corruptible part alike,"—let us discuss these points for a little; and let us show that Celsus either does not disclose his Epicurean opinions, or, as might be said by one person, has exchanged them for better, or, as another might say, has

[1] The reading in the text of Spencer and of the Benedictine ed. is *καταλειφθεῖσαν*, for which Lommatzsch has adopted the conjecture of Boherellus, *καταληφθεῖσαν*.

[2] *ὠφελείας*.

nothing in common save the name, with Celsus, the Epicurean. For he ought, in giving expression to such opinions, and in proposing to contradict not only us, but the by no means obscure sect of philosophers who are the adherents of Zeno of Citium, to have proved that the bodies of animals are not the work of God, and that the great skill displayed in their construction did not proceed from the highest intelligence. And he ought also, with regard to the countless diversities of plants, which are regulated by an inherent, incomprehensible nature,[1] and which have been created for the by no means despicable[2] use of man in general, and of the animals which minister to man, whatever other reasons may be adduced for their existence,[3] not only to have stated his opinion, but also to have shown us that it was no perfect intelligence which impressed these qualities upon the matter of plants. And when he had once represented [various] divinities as the creators of all the bodies, the soul alone being the work of God, why did not he, who separated these great acts of creation, and apportioned them among a plurality of creators, next demonstrate by some convincing reason the existence of these diversities among divinities, some of which construct the bodies of men, and others —those, say, of beasts of burden, and others—those of wild animals? And he who saw that some divinities were the creators of dragons, and of asps, and of basilisks, and others of each plant and herb according to its species, ought to have explained the causes of these diversities. For probably, had he given himself carefully to the investigation of each particular point, he would either have observed that it was one God who was the creator of all, and who made each thing with a certain object and for a certain reason; or if he had failed to observe this, he would have discovered the answer which he ought to return to those who assert that corruptibility is a thing indifferent in its nature; and that there was no absurdity in a world which consists of diverse materials, being formed by one architect, who constructed the different kinds of things so as to secure the good of the whole. Or, finally, he ought to have expressed no opinion at all on so important a doctrine, since he did not

[1] ὑπ' ἐνυπαρχούσης ἀφαντάστου φύσεως διοικουμένων.

[2] πρὸς χρείαν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον.

[3] ὅπως ποτὲ ἄλλως ὄντων.

intend to prove what he professed to demonstrate; unless, indeed, he who censures others for professing a simple faith, would have us to believe his mere assertions, although he gave out that he would not merely assert, but would prove his assertions.

Chapter lv.

But I maintain that, if he had had the patience (to use his own expression) to listen to the writings of Moses and the prophets, he would have had his attention arrested by the circumstance that the expression "God made" is applied to heaven and earth, and to what is called the firmament, and also to the lights and stars; and after these, to the great fishes, and to every living thing among creeping animals which the waters brought forth after their kinds, and to every fowl of heaven after its kind; and after these, to the wild beasts of the earth after their kind, and the beasts after their kind, and to every creeping thing upon the earth after its kind; and last of all to man. The expression "made," however, is not applied to other things; but it is deemed sufficient to say regarding light, "And it was light;" and regarding the one gathering together of all the waters that are under the whole heaven, "It was so." And in like manner also, with regard to what grew upon the earth, where it is said, "The earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after its kind and after its likeness, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself, after its kind, upon the earth." He would have inquired, moreover, whether the recorded commands of God respecting the coming into existence of each part of the world were addressed to one thing or to several;[1] and he would not lightly have charged with being unintelligible, and as having no secret meaning, the accounts related in these books, either by Moses, or, as *we* would say, by the Divine Spirit speaking in Moses, from whom also he derived the power of prophesying; since he "knew both the present, and the future, and the past," in a higher degree than those priests who are alleged by the poets to have possessed a knowledge of these things.

Chapter lvi.

Moreover, since Celsus asserts that "the soul is the work

[1] τίνι ἢ τίσιν.

of God, but that the nature of body is different; and that in this respect there is no difference between the body of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog, and that of a man, for the matter is the same, and their corruptible part alike,"—we have to say in answer to this argument of his, that if, since the same matter underlies the body of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog, or of a man, these bodies will differ in no respect from one another, it is evident then that these bodies also will differ in no respect from the sun, or the moon, or the stars, or the sky, or any other thing which is called by the Greeks a god, cognisable by the senses.[1] For the same matter, underlying *all* bodies, is, properly speaking, without qualities and without form, and derives its qualities from some [other] source, I know not whence, since Celsus will have it that nothing corruptible can be the work of God. Now the corruptible part of everything whatever, being produced from the same underlying matter, must necessarily be the same, by Celsus' own showing; unless, indeed, finding himself here hard pressed, he should desert Plato, who makes the soul arise from a certain bowl,[2] and take refuge with Aristotle and the Peripatetics, who maintain that the ether is *immaterial*,[3] and consists of a fifth nature, separate from the other four elements,[4] against which view both the Platonists and the Stoics have nobly protested. And we too, who are despised by Celsus, will contravene it, seeing we are required to explain and maintain the following statement of the prophet: "The heavens shall perish, but Thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as a garment; and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same."[5] These remarks, however, are sufficient in reply to Celsus, when he asserts that "the soul is the work of God, but that the nature of body is different;" for from his argument it follows that there is no difference between the body of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog, and that of a heavenly[6] being.

Chapter lvii.

See, then, whether we ought to yield to one who, holding

[1] αἰσθητοῦ θεοῦ. [2] Cf. Plato in *Timæo*. [3] ἄϋλον.
[4] πέμπτης παρὰ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα εἶναι φύσεως.
[5] Cf. Ps. cii. 26, 27. [6] αἰθερίου.

such opinions, calumniates the Christians, and thus abandon a doctrine which explains the difference existing among bodies as due to the different qualities, internal and external, which are implanted in them. For we, too, know that there are "bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial;" and that "the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial another;" and that even the glory of the celestial bodies is not alike: for "one is the glory of the sun, and another the glory of the stars;" and among the stars themselves, "one star differeth from another star in glory."[1] And therefore, as those who expect the resurrection of the dead, we assert that the qualities which are in bodies undergo change: since some bodies, which are sown in corruption, are raised in incorruption; and others, sown in dishonour, are raised in glory; and others, again, sown in weakness, are raised in power; and those which are sown natural bodies, are raised as spiritual.[2] That the matter which underlies bodies is capable of receiving those qualities which the Creator pleases to bestow, is a point which all of us who accept the doctrine of providence firmly hold; so that, if God so willed, one quality is at the present time implanted in this portion of matter, and afterwards another of a different and better kind. But since there are, from the beginning of the world, laws[3] established for the purpose of regulating the changes of bodies, and which will continue while the world lasts, I do not know whether, when a new and different order of things has succeeded[4] after the destruction of the world, and what our Scriptures call the end[5] [of the ages], it is not wonderful that at the present time a snake should be formed out of a dead man, growing, as the multitude affirm, out of the marrow of the back,[6] and that a bee should spring from an ox, and a wasp from a horse, and a beetle from an ass, and, generally, worms from the most of bodies. Celsus, indeed, thinks that this can be shown to be the consequence of none of these bodies being the work of God,

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 41, etc. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44. [3] ὁδοί.

[4] καινῆς διαδεξαμένης ὁδοῦ καὶ ἀλλοίας, etc. For διαδεξαμένης, Boherellus would read διαδεξομένης. Cf. Origen, *de Princip.* iii. c. v.

[5] συντέλεια.

[6] Cf. Pliny, x. c. 66: "Anguem ex medullâ hominis spinæ gigni accepimus a multis." Cf. also Ovid, *Metamorphos.* xv. fab. iv.

and that qualities (I know not whence it was so arranged that one should spring out of another) are not the work of a divine intelligence, producing the changes which occur in the qualities of matter.

Chapter lviii.

But we have something more to say to Celsus, when he declares that "the soul is the work of God, and that the nature of body is different," and puts forward such an opinion not only without proof, but even without clearly defining his meaning; for he did not make it evident whether he meant that every soul is the work of God, or only the rational soul. This, then, is what we have to say: If every soul is the work of God, it is manifest that those of the meanest irrational animals are God's work, so that the nature of all bodies is different from that of the soul. He appears, however, in what follows, where he says that "irrational animals are more beloved by God than we, and have a purer knowledge of divinity," to maintain that not only is the soul of man, but in a much greater degree that of irrational animals, the work of God; for this follows from their being said to be more beloved by God than we. Now if the rational soul alone be the work of God, then, in the first place, he did not clearly indicate that such was his opinion; and in the second place, this deduction follows from his indefinite language regarding the soul—viz. whether not every one, but only the rational, is the work of God—that neither is the nature of all bodies different [from the soul]. But if the nature of all bodies be not different, although the body of each animal correspond to its soul, it is evident that the body of that animal whose soul was the work of God, would differ from the body of that animal in which dwells a soul which was not the work of God. And so the assertion will be false, that there is no difference between the body of a bat, or of a worm, or of a frog, and that of a man.

Chapter lix.

For it would, indeed, be absurd that certain stones and buildings should be regarded as more sacred or more profane than others, according as they were constructed for the honour

of God, or for the reception of dishonourable and accursed persons;[1] while bodies should not differ from bodies, according as they are inhabited by rational or irrational beings, and according as these rational beings are the most virtuous or most worthless of mankind. Such a principle of distinction, indeed, has led some to deify the bodies of distinguished men,[2] as having received a virtuous soul, and to reject and treat with dishonour those of very wicked individuals. I do not maintain that such a principle has been always soundly exercised, but that it had its origin in a correct idea. Would a wise man, indeed, after the death of Anytus and Socrates, think of burying the bodies of both with like honours? And would he raise the same mound or tomb to the memory of both? These instances we have adduced because of the language of Celsus, that "none of these is the work of God" (where the words "of these" refer to the body of a man, or to the snakes which come out of the body; and to that of an ox, or of the bees which come from the body of an ox; and to that of a horse, or of an ass, and to the wasps which come from a horse, and the beetles which proceed from an ass); for which reason we have been obliged to return to the consideration of his statement, that "the soul is the work of God, but that the nature of body is different."

Chapter lx.

He next proceeds to say, that "a common nature pervades all the previously mentioned bodies, and one which goes and returns the same amid recurring changes."[3] In answer to this, it is evident from what has been already said, that not only does a common nature pervade those bodies which have been previously enumerated, but the heavenly bodies as well. And if this is the case, it is clear also that, according to Celsus (although I do not know whether it is according to truth), it is one nature which goes and returns the same through all bodies amid recurring changes. It is evident also that this is the case in the opinion of those who hold that the world is to perish; while those also who hold the opposite view will endeavour to

[1] σωμάτων. [2] τῶν διαφερόντων.

[3] καὶ μία εἰς ἀμοιβὴν παλίντροπον ἰοῦσα καὶ ἐπανιοῦσα.

show, without the assumption of a fifth substance,[1] that in their judgment too it is one nature "which goes and returns the same through all bodies amid recurring changes." And thus, even that which is perishable remains in order to undergo a change;[2] for the matter which underlies [all things], while its properties perish, still abides, according to the opinion of those who hold it to be uncreated. If, however, it can be shown by any arguments not to be uncreated, but to have been created for certain purposes, it is clear that it will not have the same nature of permanency which it would possess on the hypothesis of being uncreated. But it is not our object at present, in answering the charges of Celsus, to discuss these questions of natural philosophy.

Chapter lxi.

He maintains, moreover, that "no product of matter is immortal." Now, in answer to this it may be said, that if no product of matter is immortal, then either the whole world is immortal, and thus not a product of matter, or it is *not* immortal. If, accordingly, the world is immortal (which is agreeable to the view of those who say that the soul alone is the work of God, and was produced from a certain bowl), let Celsus show that the world was not produced from a matter devoid of qualities, remembering his own assertion that "no product of matter is immortal." If, however, the world is not immortal (seeing it is a product of matter), but mortal, does it also perish, or does it not? For if it perish, it will perish as being a work of God; and then, in the event of the *world* perishing, what will become of the *soul*, which is also a work of God? Let Celsus answer this! But if, perverting the notion of immortality, he will assert that, although *perishable*, it is immortal, because it does not *really* perish; that it is *capable* of dying, but does not *actually* die,—it is evident that, according to him, there will exist something which is at the same time mortal and immortal, by being capable of both conditions; and that which does not die will be mortal, and that which is not immortal by nature will be termed in a peculiar sense immortal, because it does not die! According to what

[1] σῶμα. [2] οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπολλύμενον εἰς μεταβολὴν διαμένει.

distinction, then, in the meaning of words, will he maintain that no product of matter is immortal? And thus you see that the ideas contained in his writings, when closely examined and tested, are proved *not* to be sound and incontrovertible.[1] And after making these assertions he adds: "On this point these remarks are sufficient; and if any one is capable of hearing and examining further, he will come to know [the truth]." Let us, then, who in his opinion are unintelligent individuals, see what will result from our being able to listen to him for a little, and so continue our investigation.

Chapter lxii.

After these matters, then, he thinks that he can make us acquainted in a few words with the questions regarding the nature of evil, which have been variously discussed in many important treatises, and which have received very opposite explanations. His words are: "There neither were formerly, nor are there now, nor will there be again, more or fewer evils in the world [than have always been]. For the nature of all things is one and the same, and the generation of evils is always the same." He seems to have paraphrased these words from the discussions in the *Theætetus*, where Plato makes Socrates say: "It is neither possible for evils to disappear from among men, nor for them to become established among the gods," and so on. But he appears to me not to have understood Plato correctly, although professing to include all truth[2] in this one treatise, and giving to his own book against us the title of *A True Discourse*. For the language in the *Timæus*, where it is said, "When the gods purify the earth with water," shows that the earth, when purified with water, contains less evil than it did before its purification. And this assertion, that there at one time were fewer evils in the world, is one which we make, in harmony with the opinion of Plato, because of the language in the *Theætetus*, where he says that "evils cannot disappear from among men."

[1] διελέγχεται οὐκ ἐπιδεχόμενα τὸ γενναῖον καὶ ἀναντίῤῥητον.

[2] ὁ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐκπεριλαμβάνων.

Chapter lxiii.

I do not understand how Celsus, while admitting the existence of Providence, at least so far as appears from the language of this book, can say that there never existed [at any time] either more or fewer evils, but, as it were, a fixed number; thus annihilating the beautiful doctrine regarding the indefinite [1] nature of evil, and asserting that evil, even in its own nature,[2] is infinite. Now it appears to follow from the position, that there never have been, nor are now, nor ever will be, more or fewer evils in the world; that as, according to the view of those who hold the indestructibility of the world, the equipoise of the elements is maintained by a Providence (which does not permit one to gain the preponderance over the others, in order to prevent the destruction of the world), so a kind of Providence presides, as it were, over evils (the number of which is fixed),[3] to prevent their being either increased or diminished! In other ways, too, are the arguments of Celsus concerning evil confuted, by those philosophers who have investigated the subjects of good and evil, and who have proved also from history that in former times it was without the city, and with their faces concealed by masks, that loose women hired themselves to those who wanted them; that subsequently, becoming more impudent, they laid aside their masks, though not being permitted by the laws to enter the cities, they [still] remained without them, until, as the dissoluteness of manners daily increased, they dared [finally] even to enter the cities. Such accounts are given by Chrysippus in the introduction to his work on *Good and Evil.* From this also it may be seen that evils both increase and decrease, viz. that those individuals who were called "Ambiguous"[4] used formerly to present themselves openly to view, suffering and committing all shameful things, while subserving the passions of those who frequented their society; but recently they have been expelled [from the city] by the authorities.[5] And of countless evils which, owing to the spread of wickedness, have made their appearance in human life, we may say that formerly they did *not* exist. For the most ancient histories, which bring

[1] ἀόριστον. [2] καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ. [3] τοσοῖσδε τυγχάνουσιν.
[4] Ἀμφίβολοι. [5] Ἀγορανόμοι.

innumerable other accusations against sinful men, know nothing of the perpetrators of abominable[1] crimes.

Chapter lxiv.

And now, after these arguments, and others of a similar kind, how can Celsus escape appearing in a ridiculous light, when he imagines that there never has been in the past, nor will be in the future, a greater or less number of evils? For although the nature of all things is one and the same, it does not at all follow that the production of evils is a constant quantity.[2] For although the nature of a certain individual is one and the same, yet his mind, and his reason, and his actions, are not always alike:[3] there being a time when he had not yet attained to reason; and another, when, with the possession of reason, he had become stained with wickedness, and when this increased to a greater or less degree; and again, a time when he devoted himself to virtue, and made greater or less progress therein, attaining sometimes the very summit of perfection, through longer or shorter periods of contemplation.[4] In like manner, we may make the same assertion in a higher degree of the nature of the universe,[5] that although it is one and the same in kind, yet neither do exactly the same things, nor yet things that are similar, occur in it; for we neither have invariably productive nor unproductive seasons, nor yet periods of continuous rain or of drought. And so in the same way, with regard to virtuous souls, there are neither appointed periods of fertility nor of barrenness; and the same is the case with the greater or less spread of evil. And those who desire to investigate all things to the best of their ability, must keep in view this estimate of evils, that their amount is not always the same, owing to the working of a Providence which either preserves earthly things, or purges them by means of floods and conflagrations; and effects this, perhaps, not merely with reference to things on earth, but also to the whole universe of things[6] which stands in

[1] ἀῤῥητοποιοὺς οὐκ ἴσασι.

[2] οὐ πάντως καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶν γένεσις ἀεὶ ἡ αὐτή.

[3] οὐκ ἀεὶ τὰ αὐτά ἐστι περὶ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς πράξεις.

[4] θεωρίαις. [5] τῶν ὅλων. [6] τὰ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.

need of purification, when the wickedness that is in it has become great.

Chapter lxv.

After this Celsus continues: "It is not easy, indeed, for one who is not a philosopher to ascertain the origin of evils, though it is sufficient for the multitude to say that they do not proceed from God, but cleave to matter, and have their abode among mortal things; while the course[1] of mortal things being the same from beginning to end, the same things must always, agreeably to the appointed cycles,[2] recur in the past, present, and future." Celsus here observes that it is not easy for one who is not a philosopher to ascertain the origin of evils, as if it were an easy matter for a philosopher to gain this knowledge, while for one who is not a philosopher it was difficult, though still possible, for such an one, although with great labour, to attain it. Now, to this we say, that the origin of evils is a subject which is not easy even for a philosopher to master, and that perhaps it is impossible even for such to attain a clear understanding of it, unless it be revealed to them by divine inspiration, both what evils are, and how they originated, and how they shall be made to disappear. But although ignorance of God *is* an evil, and one of the greatest of these is not to know how God is to be served and worshipped, yet, as even Celsus would admit, there are undoubtedly some philosophers who have been ignorant of this, as is evident from the views of the different philosophical sects; whereas, according to our judgment, no one is capable of ascertaining the origin of evils who does not know that it is wicked to suppose that piety is preserved uninjured amid the laws that are established in different states, in conformity with the generally prevailing ideas of government.[3] No one, moreover, who has not heard what is related of him who is called "devil," and of his "angels," and what he was before he became a devil, and *how* he became such, and what was the cause of the simultaneous apostasy of those who are termed his angels, will be able to ascertain the origin of evils.

[1] περίοδος. [2] κατὰ τὰς τεταγμένας ἀνακυκλήσεις.

[3] μὴ ἐγνωκώς κακὸν εἶναι τὸ νομίζειν εὐσέβειαν σώζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς καθεστηκόσι κατὰ τὰς κοινότερον νοουμένας πολιτείας νόμοις.

But he who would attain to this knowledge must learn more accurately the nature of demons, and know that they are not the work of God so far as respects their demoniacal nature, but only in so far as they are possessed of reason; and also what their origin was, so that they became beings of such a nature, that while converted into demons, the powers of their mind[1] remain. And if there be any topic of human investigation which is difficult for our nature to grasp, certainly the origin of evils may be considered to be such.

Chapter lxvi.

Celsus in the next place, as if he were able to tell certain secrets regarding the origin of evils, but chose rather to keep silence, and say only what was suitable to the multitude, continues as follows: "It is sufficient to say to the multitude regarding the origin of evils, that they do not proceed from God, but cleave to matter, and dwell among mortal things." It is true, certainly, that evils do not proceed from God; for according to Jeremiah, one of our prophets, it is certain that "out of the mouth of the Most High proceedeth not evil and good."[2] But to maintain that matter, dwelling among mortal things, is the cause of evils, is in our opinion not true. For it is the mind of each individual which is the cause of the evil which arises in him, and this is evil in the abstract;[3] while the actions which proceed from it are wicked, and there is, to speak with accuracy, nothing else in our view that is evil. I am aware, however, that this topic requires very elaborate treatment, which (by the grace of God enlightening the mind) may be successfully attempted by him who is deemed by God worthy to attain the necessary knowledge on this subject.

Chapter lxvii.

I do not understand how Celsus should deem it of advantage, in writing a treatise against us, to adopt an opinion which requires at least much plausible reasoning to make it appear, as far as he can do so, that "the course of mortal things is the same from beginning to end, and that the same things must always, according to the appointed cycles, recur in the past,

[1] τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. [2] Cf. Lam. iii. 38. [3] ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ κακόν.

present, and future." Now, if this be true, our free-will is annihilated.[1] For if, in the revolution of mortal things, the same events must perpetually occur in the past, present, and future, according to the appointed cycles, it is clear that, of necessity, Socrates will always be a philosopher, and be condemned for introducing strange gods and for corrupting the youth. And Anytus and Melitus must always be his accusers, and the council of the Areopagus must ever condemn him to death by hemlock. And in the same way, according to the appointed cycles, Phalaris must always play the tyrant, and Alexander of Pheræ commit the same acts of cruelty, and those condemned to the [torture of the brazen] bull of Phalaris continually pour forth their wailings from it. But if these things be granted, I do not see how our free-will can be preserved, or how praise or blame can be administered with propriety. We may say further to Celsus, in answer to such a view, that "if the course of mortal things be always the same from beginning to end, and if, according to the appointed cycles, the same events must always occur in the past, present, and future," then, according to the appointed cycles, Moses must again come forth from Egypt with the Jewish people, and Jesus again come to dwell in human life, and perform the same actions which, [according to this view], he has done not once, but countless times, as the periods have revolved. Nay, Christians too will be the same in the appointed cycles; and Celsus will again write this treatise of his, which he has done innumerable times before!

Chapter lxviii.

Celsus, however, says that it is only "the course of *mortal* things which, according to the appointed cycles, must always be the same in the past, present, and future;" whereas the majority of the Stoics maintain that this is the case not only with the course of mortal, but also with that of immortal things, and of those whom they regard as gods. For after the conflagration of the world,[2] which has taken place countless times in the past, and will happen countless times in the future, there has been, and will be, the same arrangement of all things from

[1] τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἀνῄρηται. [2] τοῦ παντός.

the beginning to the end. The Stoics, indeed, in endeavouring to parry, I don't know how, the objections raised to their views, allege that as cycle after cycle returns, all men will be altogether unchanged[1] from those who lived in former cycles; so that Socrates will not live again, but one altogether like to Socrates, who will marry a wife exactly like Xanthippe, and will be accused by men exactly like Anytus and Melitus. I do not understand, however, how the world is to be always the same, and one individual not different from another, and yet the things in it not the same, though exactly alike. But the main argument in answer to the statements of Celsus and of the Stoics will be more appropriately investigated elsewhere, since on the present occasion it is not consistent with the purpose we have in view to expatiate on these points.

Chapter lxix.

He continues to say, that "neither have visible things[2] been given to man [by God], but each individual thing comes into existence and perishes for the sake of the safety of the whole, passing agreeably to the change, which I have already mentioned, from one thing to another." It is unnecessary, however, to linger over the refutation of these statements, which have been already refuted to the best of my ability. And the following, too, has been answered, viz. that "there will neither be more nor less good and evil among mortals." This point also has been referred to, viz. that "God does not need to amend His work afresh."[3] But it is not as a man who has imperfectly designed some piece of workmanship, and executed it unskilfully, that God administers correction to the world, in purifying it by a flood or by a conflagration, but in order to prevent the tide of evil from rising to a greater height; and, moreover, I am of opinion that it is at periods which are precisely determined beforehand that He sweeps wickedness away, so as to contribute to the good of the whole world.[4] If, however, he should assert that, after the disappearance of evil, it again comes into existence, such questions will have to be examined in a special treatise. It is, then, always in order to repair what has become

[1] ἀπαραλλάκτους. [2] τὰ ὁρώμενα. [3] οὔτε τῷ Θεῷ καινοτέρας δεῖ διορθώσεως.
[4] ὅτι καὶ πάντη τεταγμένως αὐτὴν ἀφανίζων συμφερόντως τῷ παντί.

faulty[1] that God desires to amend His work afresh. For although, in the creation of the world, all things had been arranged by Him in the most beautiful and stable manner, He nevertheless needed to exercise some healing power upon those who were labouring under the disease of wickedness, and upon a whole world, which was polluted as it were thereby. But nothing has been neglected by God, or will be neglected by Him; for He does at each particular juncture what it becomes Him to do in a perverted and changed world. And as a husbandman performs different acts of husbandry upon the soil and its productions, according to the varying seasons of the year, so God administers entire ages of time, as if they were, so to speak, so many individual years, performing during each one of them what is requisite with a reasonable regard to the care of the world; and this, as it is truly understood by God alone, so also is it accomplished by Him.

Chapter lxx.

Celsus has made a statement regarding evils of the following nature, viz., that "although a thing may seem to you to be evil, it is by no means certain that it is so; for you do not know what is of advantage to yourself, or to another, or to the whole world." Now this assertion is made with a certain degree of caution;[2] and it hints that the nature of evil is not wholly wicked, because that which may be considered so in individual cases, may contain something which is of advantage to the whole community. However, lest any one should mistake my words, and find a pretence of wrongdoing, as if his wickedness were profitable to the world, or at least *might* be so, we have to say, that although God, who preserves the free-will of each individual, may make use of the evil of the wicked for the administration of the world, so disposing them as to conduce to the benefit of the whole; yet, notwithstanding, such an individual is deserving of censure, and as such has been appointed for a use, which is a subject of loathing to each separate individual, although of advantage to the whole community.[3] It is as if one were to say

[1] τὰ σφάλματα ἀναλαμβάνειν.

[2] ἔχει τι εὐλαβές.

[3] καὶ ὡς ψεκτὸς κατατέτακται εἰς χρείαν ἀπευκταίαν μὲν ἑκάστῳ, χρήσιμον δὲ τῷ παντί.

that in the case of a city, a man who had committed certain crimes, and on account of these had been condemned to serve in public works that were useful to the community, did something that was of advantage to the entire city, while he himself was engaged in an abominable task,[1] in which no one possessed of moderate understanding would wish to be engaged. Paul also, the apostle of Jesus, teaches us that even the very wicked will contribute to the good of the whole, while in themselves they will be amongst the vile, but that the most virtuous men, too, will be of the greatest advantage to the world, and will therefore on that account occupy the noblest position. His words are: "But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour. If a man therefore purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, prepared unto every good work."[2] These remarks I have thought it necessary to make in reply to the assertion, that "although a thing may seem to you to be evil, it is by no means certain that it is so, for you do not know what is of advantage either to yourself or to another," in order that no one may take occasion from what has been said on the subject to commit sin, on the pretext that he will thus be useful to the world.

Chapter lxxi.

But as, in what follows, Celsus, not understanding that the language of Scripture regarding God is adapted to an anthropopathic point of view, ridicules those passages which speak of words of anger addressed to the ungodly, and of threatenings directed against sinners, we have to say that, as we ourselves, when talking with very young children, do not aim at exerting our own power of eloquence,[3] but, adapting ourselves to the weakness of our charge, both say and do those things which may appear to us useful for the correction and improvement of the children as children, so the word of God appears to have dealt with the history, making the capacity of the hearers, and the benefit which they were to receive, the standard of the appropriateness of its announcements [regarding Him]. And,

[1] ἐν ἀπευκταίῳ πράγματι. [2] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 20, 21.
[3] οὐ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ λέγειν στοχαζόμεθα δυνατοῦ.

generally, with regard to such a style of speaking about God, we find in the book of Deuteronomy the following: "The Lord thy God bare with your manners, as a man would bear with the manners of his son."[1] It is, as it were, assuming the manners of a man in order to secure the advantage of men that the Scripture makes use of such expressions; for it would not have been suitable to the condition of the multitude, that what God had to say to them should be spoken by Him in a manner more befitting the majesty of His own person. And yet he who is anxious to attain a true understanding of Holy Scripture, will discover the spiritual truths which are spoken by it to those who are called "spiritual," by comparing the meaning of what is addressed to those of weaker mind with what is announced to such as are of acuter understanding, both meanings being frequently found in the same passage by him who is capable of comprehending it.

Chapter lxxii.

We speak, indeed, of the "wrath" of God. We do not, however, assert that it indicates any "passion" on His part, but that it is something which is assumed in order to discipline by stern means those sinners who have committed many and grievous sins. For that which is called God's "wrath," and "anger," is a means of discipline; and that such a view is agreeable to Scripture, is evident from what is said in the sixth Psalm, "O Lord, rebuke me not in Thine anger, neither chasten me in Thy hot displeasure;"[2] and also in Jeremiah, "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment: not in Thine anger, lest Thou bring me to nothing."[3] Any one, moreover, who reads in the second book of Kings of the "wrath" of God, inducing David to number the people, and finds from the first book of Chronicles that it was the devil who suggested this measure, will, on comparing together the two statements, easily see for what purpose the "wrath" is mentioned, of which "wrath," as the Apostle Paul declares, all men are children: "We were by nature

[1] Cf. Deut. i. 31. Origen appears to have read, not ἐτροφόρησεν, the common reading (Heb. נָשָׂא), but ἐτροποφόρησεν, the reading of the Codex Alex.

[2] Cf. Ps. vi. 1.

[3] Cf. Jer. x. 24.

children of wrath, even as others."[1] Moreover, that "wrath" is no passion on the part of God, but that each one brings it upon himself by his sins, will be clear from the further statement of Paul: "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." How, then, can any one treasure up for himself "wrath" against a "day of wrath," if "wrath" be understood in the sense of "passion?" or how can the "passion of wrath" be a help to discipline? Besides, the Scripture, which tells us not to be angry at all, and which says in the thirty-seventh Psalm, "Cease from anger, and forsake wrath,"[2] and which commands us by the mouth of Paul to "put off all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication,"[3] would not involve God in the same passion from which it would have us to be altogether free. It is manifest, further, that the language used regarding the wrath of God is to be understood *figuratively* from what is related of His "sleep," from which, as if awaking Him, the prophet says: "Awake, why sleepest Thou, Lord?"[4] and again: "Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine."[5] If, then, "sleep" must mean something else, and not what the first acceptation of the word conveys, why should not "wrath" also be understood in a similar way? The "threatenings," again, are intimations of the [punishments] which are to befall the wicked: for it is as if one were to call the words of a physician "threats," when he tells his patients, "I will have to use the knife, and apply cauteries, if you do not obey my prescriptions, and regulate your diet and mode of life in such a way as I direct you." It is no human passions, then, which we ascribe to God, nor impious opinions which we entertain of Him; nor do we err when we present the various narratives concerning Him, drawn from the Scriptures themselves, after careful comparison one with another. For those who are wise ambassadors of the "word" have no other object in view than to free as far as

[1] Cf. Eph. ii. 3. [2] Cf. Ps. xxxvii. 8. [3] Cf. Col. iii. 8.
[4] Ps. xliv. 23. [5] Cf. Ps. lxxviii. 65.

they can their hearers from weak opinions, and to endue them with intelligence.

Chapter lxxiii.

And as a sequel to his non-understanding of the statements regarding the "wrath" of God, he continues: "Is it not ridiculous to suppose that, whereas a *man*, who became angry with the Jews, slew them all from the youth upwards, and burned their city (so powerless were they to resist him), the mighty *God*, as they say, being angry, and indignant, and uttering threats, should, [instead of punishing them,] send His own *Son*, who endured the sufferings which He did?" If the Jews, then, after the treatment which they dared to inflict upon Jesus, perished with all their youth, and had their city consumed by fire, they suffered this punishment in consequence of no other wrath than that which they treasured up for themselves; for the judgment of God against them, which was determined by the divine appointment, is termed "wrath" agreeably to a traditional usage of the Hebrews. And what the Son of the mighty God suffered, He suffered voluntarily for the salvation of men, as has been stated to the best of my ability in the preceding pages. He then continues: "But that I may speak not of the Jews alone (for that is not my object), but of the whole of nature, as I promised, I will bring out more clearly what has been already stated." Now what modest man, on reading these words, and knowing the weakness of humanity, would not be indignant at the offensive nature of the promise to give an account of the "whole of nature," and at an arrogance like that which prompted him to inscribe upon his book the title which he ventured to give it [of a True Discourse]? But let us see what he has to say regarding the "whole of nature," and what he is to place "in a clearer light."

Chapter lxxiv.

He next, in many words, blames us for asserting that God made all things for the sake of man. Because from the history of animals, and from the sagacity manifested by them, he would show that all things came into existence not more for the sake of man than of the irrational animals. And here he seems to

me to speak in a similar manner to those who, through dislike of their enemies, accuse them of the same things for which their own friends are commended. For as, in the instance referred to, hatred blinds these persons from seeing that they are accusing their very dearest friends by the means through which they think they are slandering their enemies; so in the same way, Celsus also, becoming confused in his argument, does not see that he is bringing a charge against the philosophers of the Porch, who, not amiss, place man in the foremost rank, and rational nature in general before irrational animals, and who maintain that Providence created all things mainly on account of rational nature. Rational beings, then, as being the principal ones, occupy the place, as it were, of children in the womb, while irrational and soulless beings hold that of the envelope which is created along with the child.[1] I think, too, that as in cities the superintendents of the goods and market discharge their duties for the sake of no other than human beings, while dogs and other irrational animals have the benefit of the superabundance; so Providence provides *in a special manner* for rational creatures; while this also follows, that irrational creatures likewise enjoy the benefit of what is done for the sake of man. And as he is in error who alleges that the superintendents of the markets[2] make provision in no greater degree for men than for dogs, because dogs also get their share of the goods; so in a far greater degree are Celsus and they who think with him guilty of impiety towards the God who makes provision for rational beings, in asserting that His arrangements are made in no greater degree for the sustenance of human beings than for that of plants, and trees, and herbs, and thorns.

Chapter lxxv.

For, in the first place, he is of opinion that "thunders, and lightnings, and rains are not the works of God,"—thus showing more clearly at last his Epicurean leanings; and in the second place, that "even if one were to grant that these were the

[1] καὶ λόγον μὲν ἔχει τὰ λογικὰ, ἅπερ ἐστὶ προηγούμενα, παίδων γεννωμένων· τὰ δ' ἄλογα καὶ τὰ ἄψυχα χωρίου συγκτιζομένου τῷ παιδίῳ.

[2] ἀγορανόμοι.

works of God, they are brought into existence not more for the support of us who are human beings, than for that of plants, and trees, and herbs, and thorns,"—maintaining, like a true Epicurean, that these things are the product of chance, and not the work of Providence. For if these things are of no more use to us than to plants, and trees, and herbs, and thorns, it is evident either that they do not proceed from Providence at all, or from a providence which does not provide for us in a greater degree than for trees, and herbs, and thorns. Now, either of these suppositions is impious in itself, and it would be foolish to refute such statements by answering any one who brought against us the charge of impiety; for it is manifest to every one, from what has been said, who is the person guilty of impiety. In the next place, he adds: "Although you may say that these things, viz. plants, and trees, and herbs, and thorns, grow for the use of men, why will you maintain that they grow for the use of men rather than for that of the most savage of irrational animals?" Let Celsus then say distinctly that the great diversity among the products of the earth is not the work of Providence, but that a certain fortuitous concurrence of atoms[1] gave birth to qualities so diverse, and that it was owing to chance that so many kinds of plants, and trees, and herbs resemble one another, and that no disposing reason gave existence to them,[2] and that they do *not* derive their origin from an understanding that is beyond all admiration. We Christians, however, who are devoted to the worship of the only God, who created these things, feel grateful for them to Him who made them, because not only for us, but also (on our account) for the animals which are subject to us, He has prepared such a home,[3] seeing "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man, that He may bring forth food out of the earth, and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart."[4] But that He should have provided food even for the most savage animals is not matter of surprise, for these very animals are said by some who have philosophized [upon the subject] to have been created for the purpose of affording exercise to the

[1] *συντυχία τις ἀτόμων.*
[2] *οὐδεὶς λόγος τεχνικὸς ὑπέστησεν αὐτά.*
[3] *ἑστίαν.*
[4] Cf. Ps. civ. 14, 15.

rational creature. And one of our own wise men says somewhere: "Do not say, What is this? or Wherefore is that? for all things have been made for their uses. And do not say, What is this? or Wherefore is that? for everything shall be sought out in its season."[1]

Chapter lxxvi.

After this, Celsus, desirous of maintaining that Providence created the products of the earth, not more on our account than on that of the most savage animals, thus proceeds: "We indeed by labour and suffering earn a scanty and toilsome subsistence,[2] while all things are produced for them without their sowing and ploughing." He does not observe that God, wishing to exercise the human understanding in all countries (that it might not remain idle and unacquainted with the arts), created man a being full of wants,[3] in order that by virtue of his very needy condition he might be compelled to be the inventor of arts, some of which minister to his subsistence, and others to his protection. For it was better that those who would not have sought out divine things, nor engaged in the study of philosophy, should be placed in a condition of want, in order that they might employ their understanding in the invention of the arts, than that they should altogether neglect the cultivation of their minds, because their condition was one of abundance. The want of the necessaries of human life led to the invention on the one hand of the art of husbandry, on the other to that of the cultivation of the vine; again, to the art of gardening, and the arts of carpentry and smithwork, by means of which were formed the tools required for the arts which minister to the support of life. The want of covering, again, introduced the art of weaving, which followed that of wool-carding and spinning; and again, that of house-building: and thus the intelligence of men ascended even to the art of architecture. The want of necessaries caused the products also of other places to be conveyed, by means of the arts of sailing and pilotage,[4] to those who were without them; so that even on that account one might admire the Providence which made the rational being

[1] Cf. Ecclus. xxxix. 21, and 16, 17.

[2] μόλις καὶ ἐπιπόνως.

[3] ἐπιδεῆ.

[4] διὰ ναυτικῆς καὶ κυβερνητικῆς.

subject to want in a far higher degree than the irrational animals, and yet all with a view to his advantage. For the irrational animals have their food provided for them, because there is not in them even an impulse[1] towards the invention of the arts. They have, besides, a natural covering; for they are provided either with hair, or wings, or scales, or shells. Let the above, then, be our answer to the assertions of Celsus, when he says that "we indeed by labour and suffering earn a scanty and toilsome subsistence, while all things are produced for them without their sowing and ploughing."

Chapter lxxvii.

In the next place, forgetting that his object is to accuse both Jews and Christians, he quotes against himself an iambic verse of Euripides, which is opposed to his view, and joining issue with the words, charges them with being an erroneous statement. His words are as follow: "But if you will quote the saying of Euripides, that

'The Sun and Night are to mortals slaves,'[2]

why should they be so in a greater degree to us than to ants and flies? For the night is created for them in order that they may rest, and the day that they may see and resume their work." Now it is undoubted, that not only have certain of the Jews and Christians declared that the sun and the heavenly bodies[3] are our servants; but he also has said this, who, according to some, is the philosopher of the stage,[4] and who was a hearer of the lectures on the philosophy of nature delivered by Anaxagoras. But this man asserts that all things in the world are subject to all rational beings,—one rational nature being taken to represent all, on the principle of a part standing for the whole;[5] which, again, clearly appears from the verse:

"The Sun and Night are to mortals slaves."

Perhaps the tragic poet meant the day when he said the sun,

[1] ἀφορμήν. [2] Cf. Eurip. *Phœniss.* v. 512. [3] τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ.

[4] ὁ κατὰ τινας Σκηνικὸς Φιλόσοφος. Euripides himself is the person alluded to. He is called by Athenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* v.), ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς Φιλόσοφος.—De la Rue.

[5] συνεκδοχικῶς.

inasmuch as it is the cause of the day,—teaching that those things which most need the day and night are the things which are under the moon, and other things in a less degree than those which are upon the earth. Day and night, then, are subject to mortals, being created for the sake of rational beings. And if ants and flies, which labour by day and rest by night, have, besides, the benefit of those things which were created for the sake of men, we must not say that day and night were brought into being for the sake of ants and flies, nor must we suppose that they were created for the sake of nothing, but, agreeably to the design of Providence, were formed for the sake of man.

Chapter lxxviii.

He next proceeds further to object against himself[1] what is said on behalf of man, viz. that the irrational animals were created on his account, saying: "If one were to call us the lords of the animal creation because we hunt the other animals and live upon their flesh, we would say, Why were not *we* rather created on *their* account, since they hunt and devour us? Nay, *we* require nets and weapons, and the assistance of many persons, along with dogs, when engaged in the chase; while they are immediately and spontaneously provided by nature with weapons which easily bring us under their power." And here we may observe, that the gift of understanding has been bestowed upon us as a mighty aid, far superior to any weapon which wild beasts may seem to possess. We, indeed, who are far weaker in bodily strength than the beasts, and shorter in stature than some of them, yet by means of our understanding obtain the mastery, and capture the huge elephants. We subdue by our gentle treatment those animals whose nature it is to be tamed, while with those whose nature is different, or which do not appear likely to be of use to us when tamed, we take such precautionary measures, that when we desire it, we keep such wild beasts shut up; and when we need the flesh of their bodies for food, we slaughter them, as we do those beasts which are not of a savage nature. The Creator, then, has constituted all things the servants of the rational being

[1] ἑαυτῷ ἀνθυποφέρει.

and of his natural understanding. For some purposes we require dogs, say as guardians of our sheep-folds, or of our cattle-yards, or goat-pastures, or of our dwellings; and for other purposes we need oxen, as for agriculture; and for others, again, we make use of those which bear the yoke, or beasts of burden. And so it may be said that the race of lions, and bears, and leopards, and wild boars, and such like, has been given to us in order to call into exercise the elements of the manly character that exists within us.

Chapter lxxix.

In the next place, in answer to the human race, who perceive their own superiority, which far exceeds that of the irrational animals, he says: "With respect to your assertion, that God gave you the power to capture wild beasts, and to make your own use of them, we would say that, in all probability, before cities were built, and arts invented, and societies such as now exist were formed, and weapons and nets employed, men were generally caught and devoured by wild beasts, while wild beasts were very seldom captured by men." Now, in reference to this, observe that although men catch wild beasts, and wild beasts make prey of men, there is a great difference between the case of such as by means of their understanding obtain the mastery over those whose superiority consists in their savage and cruel nature, and that of those who do not make use of their understanding to secure their safety from injury by wild beasts. But when Celsus says, "before cities were built, and arts invented, and societies such as now exist were formed," he appears to have forgotten what he had before said, that "the world was uncreated and incorruptible, and that it was only the things on earth which underwent deluges and conflagrations, and that all these things did not happen at the same time." Now let it be granted that these admissions on his part are entirely in harmony with our views, though not at all with him and his statements made above; yet what does it all avail to prove that in the beginning men were mostly captured and devoured by wild beasts, while wild beasts were never caught by men? For, since the world was created in conformity with the will of Providence, and God presided over the

universe of things, it was necessary that the elements[1] of the human race should at the commencement of its existence be placed under some protection of the higher powers, so that there might be formed from the beginning a union of the divine nature with that of men. And the poet of Ascra, perceiving this, sings:

> "For common then were banquets, and common were seats,
> Alike to immortal gods and mortal men."[2]

Chapter lxxx.

Those Holy Scriptures, moreover, which bear the name of Moses, introduce the first men as hearing divine voices and oracles, and beholding sometimes the angels of God coming to visit them. For it was probable that in the beginning of the world's existence human nature would be assisted to a greater degree [than afterwards], until progress had been made towards the attainment of understanding and the other virtues, and the invention of the arts, and they should thus be able to maintain life of themselves, and no longer stand in need of superintendents, and of those to guide them who do so with a miraculous manifestation of the means which subserve the will of God. Now it follows from this, that it is false that "in the beginning men were captured and devoured by wild beasts, while wild beasts were very seldom caught by men." And from this, too, it is evident that the following statement of Celsus is untrue, that "in this way God rather subjected men to wild beasts." For God did not subject men to wild beasts, but gave wild beasts to be a prey to the understanding of man, and to the arts, which are directed against them, and which are the product of the understanding. For it was not without the help of God[3] that men desired for themselves the means of protection against wild beasts, and of securing the mastery over them.

Chapter lxxxi.

Our noble opponent, however, not observing how many philosophers there are who admit the existence of Providence,

[1] ζώπυρα.

[2] Cf. Hesiod, *Fragmenta Incerta*, ed. Goettling, p. 231.

[3] οὐ γὰρ ἀθεεί.

and who hold that Providence created all things for the sake of rational beings, overturns as far as he can those doctrines which are of use in showing the harmony that prevails in these matters between Christianity and philosophy; nor does he see how great is the injury done to religion from accepting the statement that before God there is no difference between a man and an ant or a bee, but proceeds to add, that "if men appear to be superior to irrational animals on this account, that they have built cities, and make use of a political constitution, and forms of government, and sovereignties,[1] this is to say nothing to the purpose, for ants and bees do the same. Bees, indeed, have a sovereign, who has followers and attendants; and there occur among them wars and victories, and slaughterings of the vanquished,[2] and cities and suburbs, and a succession of labours, and judgments passed upon the idle and the wicked; for the drones are driven away and punished." Now here he did not observe the difference that exists between what is done after reason and consideration, and what is the result of an irrational nature, and is purely mechanical. For the origin of these things is not explained by the existence of any rational principle in those who make them, because they do not possess any such principle; but the most ancient Being, who is also the Son of God, and the King of all things that exist, has created an irrational nature, which, as being irrational, acts as a help to those who are deemed worthy of reason. Cities, accordingly, were established among men, with many arts and well-arranged laws; while constitutions, and governments, and sovereignties among men are either such as are properly so termed, and which exemplify certain virtuous tendencies and workings, or they are those which are improperly so called, and which were devised, so far as could be done, in imitation of the former: for it was by contemplating these that the most successful legislators established the best constitutions, and governments, and sovereignties. None of these things, however, can be found among irrational animals, although Celsus may transfer

[1] ἡγεμονίαις.

[2] τῶν ἡττημένων αἱρέσεις. "Nota αἱρέσεις hoc loco sumi pro internecionibus, cædibus. Haud scio an alibi reperiatur pari significatu. Forte etiam scribendum καθαιρέσεις."—Ruæus.

rational names, and arrangements which belong to rational beings, as cities and constitutions, and rulers and sovereignties, even to ants and bees; in respect to which matters, however, ants and bees merit no approval, because they do not act from reflection. But we ought to admire the divine nature, which extended even to irrational animals the capacity, as it were, of imitating rational beings, perhaps with a view of putting rational beings to shame; so that by looking upon ants, for instance, they might become more industrious and more thrifty in the management of their goods; while, by considering the bees, they might place themselves in subjection to their Ruler, and take their respective parts in those constitutional duties which are of use in ensuring the safety of cities.

Chapter lxxxii.

Perhaps also the so-called wars among the bees convey instruction as to the manner in which wars, if ever there arise a necessity for them, should be waged in a just and orderly way among men. But the bees have no cities or suburbs; while their hives and hexagonal cells, and succession of labours, are for the sake of men, who require honey for many purposes, both for cure of disordered bodies, and as a pure article of food. Nor ought we to compare the proceedings taken by the bees against the drones with the judgments and punishments inflicted on the idle and wicked in cities. But, as I formerly said, we ought on the one hand in these things to admire the divine nature, and on the other to express our admiration of man, who is capable of considering and admiring all things (as co-operating with Providence), and who executes not merely the works which are determined by the providence of God, but also those which are the consequences of his own foresight.

Chapter lxxxiii.

After Celsus has finished speaking of the bees, in order to depreciate (as far as he can) the cities, and constitutions, and governments, and sovereignties not only of us Christians, but of all mankind, as well as the wars which men undertake on behalf of their native countries, he proceeds, by way of digression, to pass a eulogy upon the ants, in order that, while

praising them, he may compare the measures which men take to secure their subsistence with those adopted by these insects,[1] and so evince his contempt for the forethought which makes provision for winter, as being nothing higher than the irrational providence of the ants, as he regards it. Now might not some of the more simple-minded, and such as know not how to look into the nature of all things, be turned away (so far, at least, as Celsus could accomplish it) from helping those who are weighed down with the burdens [of life], and from sharing their toils, when he says of the ants, that "they help one another with their loads, when they see one of their number toiling under them?" For he who needs to be disciplined by the word, but who does not at all understand[2] its voice, will say: "Since, then, there is no difference between us and the ants, even when we help those who are weary with bearing their heavy burdens, why should we continue to do so to no purpose?" And would not the ants, as being irrational creatures, be greatly puffed up, and think highly of themselves, because their works were compared to those of men? while men, on the other hand, who by means of their reason are enabled to hear how their philanthropy[3] towards others is contemned, would be injured, so far as could be effected by Celsus and his arguments: for he does not perceive that, while he wishes to turn away from Christianity those who read his treatise, he turns away also the sympathy of those who are not Christians from those who bear the heaviest burdens [of life]. Whereas, had he been a philosopher, who was capable of perceiving the good which men may do each other, he ought, in addition to not removing along with Christianity the blessings which are found amongst men, to have lent his aid to co-operate (if he had it in his power) with those principles of excellence which are common to Christianity and the rest of mankind. Moreover, even if the ants set apart in a place by themselves those grains which sprout forth, that they may not swell into bud, but may continue throughout the year as their food, this is not to be deemed as evidence of the existence of *reason* among ants, but as the work of the universal

[1] παραβάλῃ τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς τοὺς μύρμηκας. "Verba: τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς τοὺς μύρμηκας addititia videntur et recidenda."—Ruæus.

[2] ἐπαΐων.

[3] τὸ κοινωνικόν.

mother, Nature, which adorned even irrational animals, so that even the most insignificant is not omitted, but bears traces of the reason implanted in it by nature. Unless, indeed, by these assertions Celsus means obscurely to intimate (for in many instances he would like to adopt Platonic ideas) that all souls are of the same species, and that there is no difference between that of a man and those of ants and bees, which is the act of one who would bring down the soul from the vault of heaven, and cause it to enter not only a human body, but that of an animal. Christians, however, will not yield their assent to such opinions: for they have been instructed before now that the human soul was created in the image of God; and they see that it is impossible for a nature fashioned in the divine image to have its [original] features altogether obliterated, and to assume others, formed after I know not what likeness of irrational animals.

Chapter lxxxiv.

And since he asserts that, "when ants die, the survivors set apart a special place [for their interment], and that their ancestral sepulchres such a place is," we have to answer, that the greater the laudations which he heaps upon irrational animals, so much the more does he magnify (although against his will) the work of that reason which arranged all things in order, and points out the skill[1] which exists among men, and which is capable of adorning by its reason even the gifts which are bestowed by nature on the irrational creation. But why do I say "irrational," since Celsus is of opinion that these animals, which, agreeably to the common ideas of all men, are termed irrational, are not really so? Nor does *he* regard the ants as devoid of reason, who professed to speak of "universal nature," and who boasted of his truthfulness in the inscription of his book. For, speaking of the ants conversing with one another, he uses the following language: "And when they meet one another they enter into conversation, for which reason they never mistake their way; consequently they possess a full endowment of reason, and some common ideas on certain general subjects, and a voice by which they express themselves regarding accidental

[1] ἐντρέχειαν.

things."[1] Now conversation between one man and another is carried on by means of a voice, which gives expression to the meaning intended, and which also gives utterances concerning what are called "accidental things;" but to say that this was the case with ants would be a most ridiculous assertion.

Chapter lxxxv.

He is not ashamed, moreover, to say, in addition to these statements (that the unseemly character[2] of his opinions may be manifest to those who will live after him): "Come now, if one were to look down from heaven upon earth, in what respect would *our* actions appear to differ from those of ants and bees?" Now does he who, according to his own supposition, looks from heaven upon the proceedings of men and ants, look upon their bodies alone, and not rather have regard to the controlling reason which is called into action by reflection;[3] while, on the other hand, the guiding principle of the latter is irrational, and set in motion irrationally by impulse and fancy, in conjunction with a certain natural apparatus?[4] But it is absurd to suppose that he who looks from heaven upon earthly things would desire to look from such a distance upon the *bodies* of men and ants, and would not rather consider the nature of the guiding principles, and the source of impulses, whether that be rational or irrational. And if he once look upon the source of all impulses, it is manifest that he would behold also the difference which exists, and the superiority of man, not only over ants, but even over elephants. For he who looks from heaven will see among irrational creatures, however large their bodies, no other principle[5] than, so to speak, irrationality;[6] while amongst rational beings he will discover reason, the common possession of men, and of divine and heavenly beings, and perhaps of the supreme God Himself, on account of which

[1] οὐκοῦν καὶ λόγου συμπλήρωσις ἐστι παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι καθολικῶν, τινων καὶ φωνὴ, καὶ τυγχάνοντα σημαινόμενα.

[2] ἀσχημοσύνην.

[3] οὐ καταυοεῖ δὲ τὸ λογικὸν ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ λογισμῷ κινούμενον;

[4] μετά τινος φυσικῆς ὑποκατασκευῆς.

[5] ἀρχήν.

[6] τὴν ἀλογίαν.

man is said to have been created in the image of God, for the image of the Supreme God is his reason.[1]

Chapter lxxxvi.

Immediately after this, as if doing his utmost to reduce the human race to a still lower position, and to bring them to the level of the irrational animals, and desiring to omit not a single circumstance related of the latter which manifests their greatness, he declares that "in certain individuals among the irrational creation there exists the power of sorcery;" so that even in this particular men cannot specially pride themselves, nor wish to arrogate a superiority over irrational creatures. And the following are his words: "If, however, men entertain lofty notions because of their possessing the power of sorcery, yet even in that respect are serpents and eagles their superiors in wisdom; for they are acquainted with many prophylactics against persons and diseases, and also with the virtues of certain stones which help to preserve their young. If men, however, fall in with these, they think that they have gained a wonderful possession." Now, in the first place, I know not why he should designate as sorcery the knowledge of natural prophylactics displayed by animals,—whether that knowledge be the result of experience, or of some natural power of apprehension;[2] for the term "sorcery" has by usage been assigned to something else. Perhaps, indeed, he wishes quietly, as an Epicurean, to censure the entire use of such arts, as resting only on the professions of sorcerers. However, let it be granted him that men *do* pride themselves greatly upon the knowledge of such arts, whether they are sorcerers or not: how can serpents be in this respect wiser than men, when they make use of the well-known fennel[3] to sharpen their power of vision and to produce rapidity of movement, having obtained this natural power not from the exercise of reflection, but from the constitution of their body,[4] while men do not, like serpents, arrive at such knowledge merely by nature, but partly by experiment, partly by reason, and sometimes by reflection and knowledge? So, if eagles, too, in order to preserve their young

[1] λόγος.
[2] Φυσικήν τινα κατάληψιν.
[3] τῷ μαραθρῳ.
[4] ἀλλ' ἐκ κατασκευῆς.

in the nest, carry thither the eagle-stone when they have discovered it, how does it appear that they are wise, and more intelligent than men, who find out by the exercise of their reflective powers and of their understanding what has been bestowed by nature upon eagles as a gift?

Chapter lxxxvii.

Let it be granted, however, that there are other prophylactics against poisons known to animals: what does that avail to prove that it is not nature, but reason, which leads to the discovery of such things among them? For if reason were the discoverer, this one thing (or, if you will, one or two more things) would not be (exclusive[1] of all others) the sole discovery made by serpents, and some other thing the sole discovery of the eagle, and so on with the rest of the animals; but as many discoveries would have been made amongst them as among men. But now it is manifest from the determinate inclination of the nature of each animal towards certain kinds of help, that they possess neither wisdom nor reason, but a natural constitutional tendency implanted by the Logos[2] towards such things in order to ensure the preservation of the animal. And, indeed, if I wished to join issue with Celsus in these matters, I might quote the words of Solomon from the book of Proverbs, which run thus: "There be four things which are little upon the earth, but these are wiser than the wise: The ants are a people not strong, yet they prepare their meat in the summer; the conies[3] are but a feeble folk, yet make they their houses in the rocks; the locusts have no king, yet go they forth in order at one command; and the spotted lizard,[4] though leaning upon its hands, and being easily captured, dwelleth in kings' fortresses."[5] I do not quote these words, however, as taking them in their literal signification, but, agreeably to the title of the book (for it is inscribed "Proverbs"), I investigate them as containing a secret meaning. For it is the custom of these

[1] ἀποτεταγμένως.
[2] ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου γεγενημένη.
[3] χοιρογρύλλιοι. Heb. שְׁפַנִּים.
[4] ἀσκαλαβώτης.
[5] Cf. Prov. xxx. 24–28.

writers [of Scripture] to distribute into many classes those writings which express one sense when taken literally,[1] but which convey a different signification as their hidden meaning; and one of these kinds of writing is "Proverbs." And for this reason, in our Gospels too, is our Saviour described as saying: "These things have I spoken to you in proverbs, but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs."[2] It is not, then, the *visible* ants which are "wiser even than the wise," but they who are indicated as such under the "proverbial" style of expression. And such must be our conclusion regarding the rest of the animal creation, although Celsus regards the books of the Jews and Christians as exceedingly simple and commonplace,[3] and imagines that those who give them an allegorical interpretation do violence to the meaning of the writers. By what we have said, then, let it appear that Celsus calumniates us in vain, and let his assertions that serpents and eagles are wiser than men also receive their refutation.

Chapter lxxxviii.

And wishing to show at greater length that even the thoughts of God entertained by the human race are not superior to those of all other mortal creatures, but that certain of the irrational animals are capable of thinking about Him regarding whom opinions so discordant have existed among the most acute of mankind—Greeks and Barbarians—he continues: "If, because man has been able to grasp the idea of God, he is deemed superior to the other animals, let those who hold this opinion know that this capacity will be claimed by many of the other animals; and with good reason: for what would any one maintain to be more divine than the power of foreknowing and predicting future events? Men accordingly acquire the art from the other animals, and especially from birds. And those who listen to the indications furnished by them, become possessed of the gift of prophecy. If, then, birds, and the other prophetic animals, which are enabled by the gift of God to foreknow events, instruct us by means of signs, so much the nearer do they seem to be to the society of God, and to be endowed with

[1] *αὐτόθεν.* [2] John xvi. 25. [3] *ἰδιωτικά.*

greater wisdom, and to be more beloved by Him. The more intelligent of men, moreover, say that the animals hold meetings which are more sacred than our assemblies, and that they know what is said at these meetings, and show that in reality they possess this knowledge, when, having previously stated that the birds have declared their intention of departing to some particular place, and of doing this thing or the other, the truth of their assertions is established by the departure of the birds to the place in question, and by their doing what was foretold. And no race of animals appears to be more observant of oaths than the elephants are, or to show greater devotion to divine things; and this, I presume, solely because they have some knowledge of God." See here now how he at once lays hold of, and brings forward as acknowledged facts, questions which are the subject of dispute among those philosophers, not only among the Greeks, but also among the Barbarians, who have either discovered or learned from certain demons some things about birds of augury and other animals, by which certain prophetic intimations are said to be made to men. For, in the first place, it has been disputed whether there *is* an art of augury, and, in general, a method of divination by animals, or not. And, in the second place, they who admit that there is an art of divination by birds, are not agreed about the manner of the divination; since some maintain that it is from certain demons or gods of divination[1] that the animals receive their impulses to action—the birds to flights and sounds of different kinds, and the other animals to movements of one sort or another. Others, again, believe that their souls are more divine in their nature, and fitted to operations of that kind, which is a most incredible supposition.

Chapter lxxxix.

Celsus, however, seeing he wished to prove by the foregoing statements that the irrational animals are more divine and intelligent than human beings, ought to have established at greater length the actual existence of such an art of divination, and in the next place have energetically undertaken its defence, and effectually refuted the arguments of those who

[1] θεῶν μαντικῶν.

would annihilate such arts of divination, and have overturned in a convincing manner also the arguments of those who say that it is from demons or from gods that animals receive the movements which lead them to divination, and to have proved in the next place that the soul of irrational animals is more divine than that of man. For, had he done so, and manifested a philosophical spirit in dealing with such things, we should to the best of our power have met his confident assertions, refuting in the first place the allegation that irrational animals are wiser than men, and showing the falsity of the statement that they have ideas of God more sacred than ours, and that they hold among themselves certain sacred assemblies. But now, on the contrary, *he* who accuses us because we believe in the Supreme God, requires us to believe that the souls of birds entertain ideas of God more divine and distinct than those of men. Yet if this is true, the birds have clearer ideas of God than Celsus himself; and it is not matter of surprise that it should be so with him, who so greatly depreciates human beings. Nay, so far as Celsus can make it appear, the birds possess grander and more divine ideas than, I do not say we Christians do, or than the Jews, who use the same Scriptures with ourselves, but even than are possessed by the theologians among the Greeks, for they were only human beings. According to Celsus, indeed, the tribe of birds that practise divination, forsooth, understand the nature of the Divine Being better than Pherecydes, and Pythagoras, and Socrates, and Plato! We ought then to go to the birds as our teachers, in order that as, according to the view of Celsus, they instruct us by their power of divination in the knowledge of future events, so also they may free men from doubts regarding the Divine Being, by imparting to them the clear ideas which they have obtained respecting Him! It follows, accordingly, that Celsus, who regards birds as superior to men, ought to employ them as his instructors, and not one of the Greek philosophers!

Chapter xc.

But we have a few remarks to make, out of a larger number, in answer to these statements of Celsus, that we may show the ingratitude towards his Maker which is involved in his holding

these false opinions.[1] For Celsus, although a man, and "being in honour,"[2] does not possess understanding, and therefore he did not compare himself with the birds and the other irrational animals, which he regards as capable of divining; but yielding to them the foremost place, he lowered himself, and as far as he could the whole human race with him (as entertaining lower and inferior views of God than the irrational animals), beneath the Egyptians, who worship irrational animals as divinities. Let the principal point of investigation, however, be this: whether there actually is or not an art of divination, by means of birds and other living things believed to have such power. For the arguments which tend to establish either view are not to be despised. On the one hand, it is pressed upon us not to admit such an art, lest the rational being should abandon the divine oracles, and betake himself to birds; and on the other, there is the energetic testimony of many, that numerous individuals have been saved from the greatest dangers by putting their trust in divination by birds. For the present, however, let it be granted that an art of divination does exist, in order that I may in this way show to those who are prejudiced on the subject, that if this be admitted, the superiority of man over irrational animals, even over those that are endowed with power of divination, is great, and beyond all reach of comparison with the latter. We have then to say, that if there was in them any divine nature capable of foretelling future events, and so rich [in that knowledge] as out of its superabundance to make them known to any man who wished to know them, it is manifest that they would know what concerned themselves far sooner [than what concerned others]; and had they possessed this knowledge, they would have been upon their guard against flying to any particular place where men had planted snares and nets to catch them, or where archers took aim and shot at them in their flight. And especially, were eagles aware beforehand of the designs formed against their young, either by serpents crawling up to their nests and destroying them, or by men who take them for their amusement, or for any other useful purpose or service, they would not have placed their young in a spot where they

[1] τὴν ἀχάριστον ψευδοδοξίαν. [2] Ps. xlix. 12.

were to be attacked; and, in general, not one of these animals would have been captured by men, because they were more divine and intelligent than they.

Chapter xci.

But besides, if birds of augury converse with one another,[1] as Celsus maintains they do, the prophetic birds having a divine nature, and the other rational animals also ideas of the divinity and foreknowledge of future events; and if they had communicated this knowledge to others, the sparrow mentioned in Homer would not have built her nest in the spot where a serpent was to devour her and her young ones, nor would the serpent in the writings of the same poet have failed to take precautions against being captured by the eagle. For this wonderful poet says, in his poem regarding the former:

> "A mighty dragon shot, of dire portent;
> From Jove himself the dreadful sign was sent.
> Straight to the three his sanguine spires he rolled,
> And curled around in many a winding fold.
> The topmost branch a mother bird possessed;
> Eight callow infants filled the mossy nest;
> Herself the ninth: the serpent, as he hung,
> Stretched his black jaws, and crushed the dying young;
> While hovering near, with miserable moan,
> The drooping mother wailed her children gone.
> The mother last, as round the nest she flew,
> Seized by the beating wing, the monster slew:
> Nor long survived: to marble turned, he stands
> A lasting prodigy on Aulis sands.
> Such was the will of Jove; and hence we dare
> Trust in his omen, and support the war."[2]

And regarding the second—the bird—the poet says:

> "Jove's bird on rounding pinions beat the skies,
> A bleeding serpent of enormous size,
> His talons twined; alive, and curling round,
> He stung the bird, whose throat received the wound.
> Mad with the smart, he drops the fatal prey,
> In airy circles wings his painful way,

---

[1] εἴπερ οἰωνοὶ οἰωνοῖς μάχονται. For μάχονται Ruæus conjectures διαλέγονται, which is adopted by Lommatzsch.

[2] Homer, *Ilias*, ii. 308 sq. (Pope's translation.)

Floats on the winds, and rends the heaven with cries;
Amidst the host, the fallen serpent lies.
They, pale with terror, mark its spires unrolled,
And Jove's portent with beating hearts behold."[1]

Did the eagle, then, possess the power of divination, and the serpent (since this animal also is made use of by the augurs) not? But as this distinction can be easily refuted, cannot the assertion that both were capable of divination be refuted also? For if the serpent had possessed this knowledge, would not he have been on his guard against suffering what he did from the eagle? And innumerable other instances of a similar character may be found, to show that animals do not possess a prophetic soul, but that, according to the poet and the majority of mankind, it is the "Olympian himself who sent him to the light." And it is with a symbolical meaning[2] that Apollo employs the hawk[3] as his messenger, for the hawk[4] is called the "swift messenger of Apollo."[5]

Chapter xcii.

In my opinion, however, it is certain wicked demons, and, so to speak, of the race of Titans or Giants, who have been guilty of impiety towards the true God, and towards the angels in heaven, and who have fallen from it, and who haunt the denser parts of bodies, and frequent unclean places upon earth, and who, possessing some power of distinguishing future events, because they are without bodies of earthly material, engage in an employment of this kind, and desiring to lead the human race away from the true God, secretly enter the bodies of the more rapacious and savage and wicked of animals, and stir them up to do whatever they choose, and at whatever time they choose: either turning the fancies of these animals to make flights and movements of various kinds, in order that men may be caught by the divining power that is in the irrational animals, and neglect to seek after the God who contains all

[1] Homer, *Ilias*, xii. 290 sq. (Pope's translation.)

[2] κατὰ δέ τι σημεῖον. [3] ἱέραξ.

[4] κίρκος, "the hen-harrier," "Falco," or "Circus pygargus." Cf. Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*

[5] Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* xv. v. 526.

things; or to search after the pure worship of God, but allow their reasoning powers to grovel on the earth, and amongst birds and serpents, and even foxes and wolves. For it has been observed by those who are skilled in such matters, that the clearest prognostications are obtained from animals of this kind; because the demons cannot act so effectively in the milder sort of animals as they can in these, in consequence of the similarity between them in point of wickedness; and yet it is not wickedness, but something like wickedness,[1] which exists in these animals.

Chapter xciii.

For which reason, whatever else there may be in the writings of Moses which excites my wonder, I would say that the following is worthy of admiration, viz. that Moses, having observed the varying natures of animals, and having either learned from God what was peculiar to them, and to the demons which are kindred to each of the animals, or having himself ascertained these things by his own wisdom, has, in arranging the different kinds of animals, pronounced all those which are supposed by the Egyptians and the rest of mankind to possess the power of divination to be unclean, and, as a general rule, all that are not of that class to be clean. And amongst the unclean animals mentioned by Moses are the wolf, and fox, and serpent, and eagle, and hawk, and such like. And, generally speaking, you will find that not only in the law, but also in the prophets, these animals are employed as examples of all that is most wicked; and that a wolf or a fox is never mentioned for a good purpose. Each species of demon, consequently, would seem to possess a certain affinity with a certain species of animal. And as among men there are some who are stronger than others, and this not at all owing to their moral character, so, in the same way, some demons will be more powerful in things indifferent than others;[2] and one class of them employs one kind of animal for the purpose of deluding men, in accordance with the will of him who is called in our Scriptures the "prince of this world," while others predict future events by means of another kind of animal. Observe,

[1] καὶ οὐ κακίαν μέν, οἱονεὶ δὲ κακίαν οὖσαν. [2] ἐν μέσοις.

moreover, to what a pitch of wickedness the demons proceed, so that they even assume the bodies of weasels in order to reveal the future! And now, consider with yourself whether it is better to accept the belief that it is the Supreme God and His Son who stir up the birds and the other living creatures to divination, or that those who stir up these creatures, and not human beings (although they are present before them), are wicked, and, as they are called by our Scriptures, unclean demons.

Chapter xciv.

But if the soul of birds is to be esteemed divine because future events are predicted by them, why should we not rather maintain, that when omens[1] are accepted by men, the souls of those are divine through which the omens are heard? Accordingly, among such would be ranked the female slave mentioned in Homer, who ground the corn, when she said regarding the suitors:

"For the very last time, now, will they sup here."[2]

This slave, then, was divine, while the great Ulysses, the friend of Homer's Pallas Athene, was *not* divine, but understanding the words spoken by this "divine" grinder of corn as an omen, rejoiced, as the poet says:

"The divine Ulysses rejoiced at the omen."[3]

Observe, now, as the birds are possessed of a divine soul, and are capable of perceiving God, or, as Celsus says, the gods, it is clear that when we men also sneeze, we do so in consequence of a kind of divinity that is within us, and which imparts a prophetic power to our soul. For this belief is testified by many witnesses, and therefore the poet also says:

"And while he prayed, he sneezed."[4]

And Penelope, too, said:

"Perceiv'st thou not that at every word my son did sneeze?"[5]

---

[1] κληδόνες.

[2] Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* iv. v. 685; cf. also xx. vv. 116, 119.

[3] Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* xx. 120.

[4] Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* xvii. 541

[5] Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* xvii. 545.

Chapter xcv.

The true God, however, neither employs irrational animals, nor any individuals whom chance may offer,[1] to convey a knowledge of the future; but, on the contrary, the most pure and holy of human souls, whom He inspires and endows with prophetic power. And therefore, whatever else in the Mosaic writings may excite our wonder, the following must be considered as fitted to do so: "Ye shall not practise augury, nor observe the flight of birds;"[2] and in another place: "For the nations whom the Lord thy God will destroy from before thy face, shall listen to omens and divinations; but as for thee, the Lord thy God has not suffered thee to do so."[3] And he adds: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your brethren."[4] On one occasion, moreover, God, wishing by means of an augur to turn away [His people] from the practice of divination, caused the spirit that was in the augur to speak as follows: "For there is no enchantment in Jacob, nor is there divination in Israel. In due time will it be declared to Jacob and Israel what the Lord will do."[5] And now, we who knew these and similar sayings wish to observe this precept with the mystical meaning, viz. "Keep thy heart with all diligence,"[6] that nothing of a demoniacal nature may enter into our minds, or any spirit of our adversaries turn our imagination whither it chooses. But we pray that the light of the knowledge of the glory of God may shine in our hearts, and that the Spirit of God may dwell in our imaginations, and lead them to contemplate the things of God; for "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."[7]

Chapter xcvi.

We ought to take note, however, that the power of foreknowing the future is by no means a proof of divinity; for in itself it is a thing indifferent, and is found occurring amongst both good and bad. Physicians, at any rate, by means of their pro-

[1] οὔτε τοῖς τυχοῦσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
[2] Cf. Lev. xix. 26. The Septuagint here differs from the Masoretic text.
[3] Cf. Deut. xviii. 14, cf. 12. [4] Cf. Deut. xviii. 15.
[5] Cf. Num. xxiii. 23. [6] Prov. iv. 23. [7] Cf. Rom. viii. 14.

fessional skill foreknow certain things, although their character may happen to be bad. And in the same way also pilots, although perhaps wicked men, are able to foretell the signs[1] [of good or bad weather], and the approach of violent tempests of wind, and atmospheric changes,[2] because they gather this knowledge from experience and observation, although I do not suppose that on that account any one would term them "gods" if their characters happened to be bad. The assertion, then, of Celsus is false, when he says: "What could be called more divine than the power of foreknowing and foretelling the future?" And so also is this, that "many of the animals claim to have ideas of God;" for none of the irrational animals possess any idea of God. And wholly false, too, is his assertion, that "the irrational animals are nearer the society of God [than men]," when even men who are still in a state of wickedness, however great their progress in knowledge, are far removed from that society. It is, then, those alone who are truly wise and sincerely religious who are nearer to God's society; such persons as were our prophets, and Moses, to the latter of whom, on account of his exceeding purity, the Scripture said: "Moses alone shall come near the Lord, but the rest shall not come nigh."[3]

Chapter xcvii.

How impious, indeed, is the assertion of this man, who charges us with impiety, that "not only are the irrational animals wiser than the human race, but that they are more beloved by God [than they]!" And who would not be repelled [by horror] from paying any attention to a man who declared that a serpent, and a fox, and a wolf, and an eagle, and a hawk, were more beloved by God than the human race? For it follows from his maintaining such a position, that if these animals be more beloved by God than human beings, it is manifest that they are dearer to God than Socrates, and Plato, and Pythagoras, and Pherecydes, and those theologians whose praises he had sung a little before. And one might address him with the prayer: "If these animals be dearer to God than men, may you be beloved of God along with them, and be made

[1] ἐπισημασίας. [2] τροπάς. [3] Cf. Ex. xxiv. 2.

like to those whom you consider as dearer to Him than human beings!" And let no one suppose that such a prayer is meant as an imprecation; for who would not pray to resemble in all respects those whom he believes to be dearer to God than others, in order that he, like them, may enjoy the divine love? And as Celsus is desirous to show that the assemblies of the irrational animals are more sacred than ours, he ascribes the statement to that effect not to any ordinary individuals, but to persons of intelligence. Yet it is the virtuous alone who are truly wise, for no wicked man is so. He speaks, accordingly, in the following style: "Intelligent men say that these animals hold assemblies which are more sacred than ours, and that they know what is spoken at them, and actually prove that they are not without such knowledge, when they mention beforehand that the birds have announced their intention of departing to a particular place, or of doing this thing or that, and then show that they *have* departed to the place in question, and have done the particular thing which was foretold." Now, truly, no person of intelligence ever related such things; nor did any wise man ever say that the assemblies of the irrational animals were more sacred than those of men. But if, for the purpose of examining [the soundness of] his statements, we look to their consequences, it is evident that, in his opinion, the assemblies of the irrational animals are more sacred than those of the venerable Pherecydes, and Pythagoras, and Socrates, and Plato, and of philosophers in general; which assertion is not only incongruous[1] in itself, but full of absurdity. In order that we may believe, however, that certain individuals *do* learn from the indistinct sound of birds that they are about to take their departure, and do this thing or that, and announce these things beforehand, we would say that this information is imparted to men by demons by means of signs, with the view of having men deceived by demons, and having their understanding dragged down from God and heaven to earth, and to places lower still.

Chapter xcviii.

I do not know, moreover, how Celsus could hear of the ele-

[1] ἀπεμφαῖνον.

phants' [fidelity to] oaths, and of their great devotedness to our God, and of the knowledge which they possess of Him. For I know many wonderful things which are related of the nature of this animal, and of its gentle disposition. But I am not aware that any one has spoken of its observance of oaths; unless indeed to its gentle disposition, and its observance of compacts, so to speak, when once concluded between it and man, he give the name of keeping its oath, which statement also in itself is false. For although rarely, yet sometimes it has been recorded that, after their apparent tameness, they have broken out against men in the most savage manner, and have committed murder, and have been on that account condemned to death, because no longer of any use. And seeing that after this, in order to establish (as he thinks he does) that the stork is more pious than any human being, he adduces the accounts which are narrated regarding that creature's display of filial affection[1] in bringing food to its parents for their support, we have to say in reply, that this is done by the storks, not from a regard to what is proper, nor from reflection, but from a natural instinct; the nature which formed them being desirous to show an instance among the irrational animals which might put men to shame, in the matter of exhibiting their gratitude to their parents. And if Celsus had known how great the difference is between acting in this way from reason, and from an irrational natural impulse, he would not have said that storks are more pious than human beings. But further, Celsus, as still contending for the piety of the irrational creation, quotes the instance of the Arabian bird the phœnix, which after many years repairs to Egypt, and bears thither its parent, when dead and buried in a ball of myrrh, and deposits its body in the Temple of the Sun. Now this story is indeed recorded, and, if it be true, it is possible that it may occur in consequence of some provision of nature; divine providence freely displaying to human beings, by the differences which exist among living things, the variety of constitution which prevails in the world, and which extends even to birds, and in harmony with which He has brought into existence one creature, the only one of its

[1] ἀντιπελαργοῦντος.

kind, in order that by it men may be led to admire, not the creature, but Him who created it.

Chapter xcix.

In addition to all that he has already said, Celsus subjoins the following: "All things, accordingly, were not made for man, any more than they were made for lions, or eagles, or dolphins, but that this world, as being God's work, might be perfect and entire in all respects. For this reason all things have been adjusted, not with reference to each other, but with regard to their bearing upon the whole.[1] And God takes care of the whole, and [His] providence will never forsake it; and it does not become worse; nor does God after a time bring it back to himself; nor is He angry on account of men any more than on account of apes or flies; nor does He threaten these beings, each one of which has received its appointed lot in its proper place." Let us then briefly reply to these statements. I think, indeed, that I have shown in the preceding pages that all things were created for man, and every rational being, and that it was chiefly for the sake of the rational creature that the creation took place. Celsus, indeed, may say that this was done not more for man than for lions, or the other creatures which he mentions; but we maintain that the Creator did not form these things for lions, or eagles, or dolphins, but all for the sake of the rational creature, and "in order that this world, as being God's work, might be perfect and complete in all things." For to this sentiment we must yield our assent as being well said. And God takes care, not, as Celsus supposes, merely of the *whole*, but beyond the whole, in a special degree of every rational being. Nor will Providence ever abandon the whole; for although it should become more wicked, owing to the sin of the rational being, which is a portion of the whole, He makes arrangements to purify it, and after a time to bring back the whole to Himself. Moreover, He is not angry with apes or flies; but on human beings, as those who have transgressed the laws of nature, He sends judgments and chastisements, and threatens them by the mouth of the prophets, and by the

[1] ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ πᾶν ἔργον. "Gelenius does not recognise these words, and Guietus regards them as superfluous." They are omitted in the translation.

Saviour who came to visit the whole human race, that those who hear the threatenings may be converted by them, while those who neglect these calls to conversion may deservedly suffer those punishments which it becomes God, in conformity with that will of His which acts for the advantage of the whole, to inflict upon those who need such painful discipline and correction. But as our fourth book has now attained sufficient dimensions, we shall here terminate our discourse. And may God grant, through His Son, who is God the Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, and everything else which the sacred Scriptures when speaking of God call Him, that we may make a good beginning of the fifth book, to the benefit of our readers, and may bring it to a successful conclusion, with the aid of His word abiding in our soul.

BOOK V.

Chapter I.

IT is not, my reverend Ambrosius, because we seek after many words—a thing which is forbidden, and in the indulgence of which it is impossible to avoid sin[1]—that we now begin the fifth book of our reply to the treatise of Celsus, but with the endeavour, so far as may be within our power, to leave none of his statements without examination, and especially those in which it might appear to some that he had skilfully assailed us and the Jews. If it were possible, indeed, for me to enter along with my words into the conscience of every one without exception who peruses this work, and to extract each dart which wounds him who is not completely protected with the "whole armour" of God, and apply a rational medicine to cure the wound inflicted by Celsus, which prevents those who listen to his words from remaining "sound in the faith," I would do so. But since it is the work of God alone, in conformity with His own Spirit, and along with that of Christ, to take up His abode invisibly in those persons whom He judges worthy of being visited; so, on the other hand, is *our* object to try, by means of arguments and treatises, to confirm men in their faith, and to earn the name of "workmen needing not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."[2] And there is one thing above all which it appears to us we ought to do, if we would discharge faithfully the task enjoined upon us by you, and that is to overturn to the best of our ability the confident assertions of Celsus. Let us then quote such assertions of his as follow those which we have already refuted (the reader must decide whether we have done so successfully or not), and let us reply to them.

[1] Cf. Prov. x. 19.

[2] Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 15.

And may God grant that we approach not our subject with our understanding and reason empty and devoid of divine inspiration, that the faith of those whom we wish to aid may not depend upon human wisdom, but that, receiving the "mind" of Christ from His Father, who alone can bestow it, and being strengthened by participating in the word of God, we may pull down "every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God,"[1] and the imagination of Celsus, who exalts himself against us, and against Jesus, and also against Moses and the prophets, in order that He who "gave the word to those who published it with great power"[2] may supply us also, and bestow upon us "great power," so that faith in the word and power of God may be implanted in the minds of all who will peruse our work.

Chapter II.

We have now, then, to refute that statement of his which runs as follows: "O Jews and Christians, no God or son of a God either came or will come down [to earth]. But if you mean that certain angels did so, then what do you call them? Are they gods, or some other race of beings? Some other race of beings [doubtless], and in all probability demons." Now as Celsus here is guilty of repeating himself (for in the preceding pages such assertions have been frequently advanced by him), it is unnecessary to discuss the matter at greater length, seeing what we have already said upon this point may suffice. We shall mention, however, a few considerations out of a greater number, such as we deem in harmony with our former arguments, but which have not altogether the same bearing as they, and by which we shall show that in asserting generally that no God, or son of God, ever descended [among men], he overturns not only the opinions entertained by the majority of mankind regarding the manifestation of Deity, but also what was formerly admitted by himself. For if the general statement, that "no God or son of God has come down or will come down," be truly maintained by Celsus, it is manifest that we have here overthrown the belief in the existence of gods upon the earth who had descended from

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 5. [2] Cf. Ps. lxviii. 11.

heaven either to predict the future to mankind or to heal them by means of divine responses; and neither the Pythian Apollo, nor Esculapius, nor any other among those supposed to have done so, would be a god descended from heaven. He might, indeed, either be a god who had obtained as his lot [the obligation] to dwell on earth for ever, and be thus a fugitive, as it were, from the abode of the gods, or he might be one who had no power to share in the society of the gods in heaven;[1] or else Apollo, and Esculapius, and those others who are believed to perform acts on earth, would not be gods, but only certain demons, much inferior to those wise men among mankind, who on account of their virtue ascend to the vault[2] of heaven.

Chapter III.

But observe how, in his desire to subvert our opinions, he who never acknowledged himself throughout his whole treatise to be an Epicurean, is convicted of being a deserter to that sect. And now is the time for you, [reader], who peruse the works of Celsus, and give your assent to what has been advanced, either to overturn the belief in a God who visits the human race, and exercises a providence over each individual man, or to grant this, and prove the falsity of the assertions of Celsus. If you, then, wholly annihilate providence, you will falsify those assertions of his in which he grants the existence of "God and a providence," in order that you may maintain the truth of your own position; but if, on the other hand, you still admit the existence of providence, because you do not assent to the dictum of Celsus, that "neither has a God nor the son of a God come down nor is to come down[3] to mankind," why not rather carefully ascertain from the statements made regarding Jesus, and the prophecies uttered concerning Him, who it is that we are to consider as having come down to the human race as God, and the Son of God?—whether that Jesus who said and ministered so much, or those who, under pretence of oracles and divinations, do not reform the morals of their worshippers, but who have besides apostatized from the pure and holy worship and honour due to the Maker of all things, and who tear away the souls of those who give heed to

[1] τοῖς ἐκεῖ θεοῖς. [2] ἄψιδα. [3] κατέρχεσθαι.

them from the one only visible and true God, under a pretence of paying honour to a multitude of deities?

Chapter iv.

But since he says, in the next place, as if the Jews or Christians had answered regarding those who come down to visit the human race, that they were angels: "But if ye say that they are angels, what do you call them?" he continues, "Are they gods, or some other race of beings?" and then again introduces us as if answering, "Some other race of beings, and probably demons,"—let us proceed to notice these remarks. For we indeed acknowledge that angels are "ministering spirits," and we say that "they are sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;"[1] and that they ascend, bearing the supplications of men, to the purest of the heavenly places in the universe, or even to supercelestial regions purer still;[2] and that they come down from these, conveying to each one, according to his deserts, something enjoined by God to be conferred by them upon those who are to be the recipients of His benefits. Having thus learned to call these beings "angels" from their employments, we find that because they are divine they are sometimes termed "God" in the sacred Scriptures,[3] but not so that we are commanded to honour and worship in place of God those who minister to us, and bear to us His blessings. For every prayer, and supplication, and intercession, and thanksgiving, is to be sent up to the Supreme God through the High Priest, who is above all the angels, the living Word and God. And to the Word Himself shall we also pray and make intercessions, and offer thanksgivings and supplications to Him, if we have the capacity of distinguishing between the proper use and abuse of prayer.[4]

Chapter v.

For to invoke angels without having obtained a knowledge

[1] Cf. Heb. i. 14.

[2] ἐν τοῖς καθαρωτάτοις τοῦ κόσμου χωρίοις ἐπουρανίοις, ἢ καὶ τοῖς τούτων καθαρωτέροις ὑπερουρανίοις.

[3] Cf. Ps. lxxxvi. 8, xcvi. 4, cxxxvi. 2.

[4] ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως.

of their nature greater than is possessed by men, would be contrary to reason. But, conformably to our hypothesis, let this knowledge of them, which is something wonderful and mysterious, be obtained. Then this knowledge, making known to us their nature, and the offices to which they are severally appointed, will not permit us to pray with confidence to any other than to the Supreme God, who is sufficient for all things, and that through our Saviour the Son of God, who is the Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and everything else which the writings of God's prophets and the apostles of Jesus entitle Him. And it is enough to secure that the holy angels of God be propitious to us, and that they do all things on our behalf, that our disposition of mind towards God should imitate as far as it is within the power of human nature the example of these holy angels, who again follow the example of their God; and that the conceptions which we entertain of His Son, the Word, so far as attainable by us, should not be opposed to the clearer conceptions of Him which the holy angels possess, but should daily approach these in clearness and distinctness. But because Celsus has not read our Holy Scriptures, he gives himself an answer as if it came from us, saying that we "assert that the angels who come down from heaven to confer benefits on mankind are a different race from the gods," and adds that "in all probability they would be called demons by us:" not observing that the name "demons" is not a term of indifferent meaning like that of "men," among whom some are good and some bad, nor yet a term of excellence like that of "the gods," which is applied not to wicked demons, or to statues, or to animals, but (by those who know divine things) to what is truly divine and blessed; whereas the term "demons" is always applied to those wicked powers, freed from the encumbrance of a grosser body, who lead men astray, and fill them with distractions, and drag them down from God and supercelestial thoughts to things here below.

Chapter vi.

He next proceeds to make the following statement about the Jews:—"The first point relating to the Jews which is fitted to excite wonder, is that they should worship the heaven and

the angels who dwell therein, and yet pass by and neglect its most venerable and powerful parts, as the sun, and moon, and the other heavenly bodies, both fixed stars and planets, as if it were possible that 'the whole' could be God, and yet its parts not divine; or [as if it were reasonable] to treat with the greatest respect those who are said to appear to such as are in darkness somewhere, blinded by some crooked sorcery, or dreaming dreams through the influence of shadowy spectres,[1] while those who prophesy so clearly and strikingly to all men, by means of whom rain, and heat, and clouds, and thunder (to which they offer worship), and lightnings, and fruits, and all kinds of productiveness, are brought about,—by means of whom God is revealed to them,—the most prominent heralds among those beings that are above,—those that are truly heavenly angels,—are to be regarded as of no account!" In making these statements, Celsus appears to have fallen into confusion, and to have penned them from false ideas of things which he did not understand; for it is patent to all who investigate the practices of the Jews, and compare them with those of the Christians, that the Jews who follow the law, which, speaking in the person of God, says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me: thou shalt not make unto thee an image, nor a likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them,"[2] worship nothing else than the Supreme God, who made the heavens, and all things besides. Now it is evident that those who live according to the law, and worship the *Maker* of heaven, will not worship the heaven at the same time with God. Moreover, no one who obeys the law of Moses will bow down to the angels who are in heaven; and, in like manner, as they do not bow down to sun, moon, and stars, the host of heaven, they refrain also from doing obeisance to heaven and its angels, obeying the law which declares: "Lest thou lift up thine eyes to heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldst be

[1] ἢ τοὺς μὲν ἐν σκότῳ ποῦ ἐκ γοητείας οὐκ ὀρθῆς τυφλώττουσιν, ἢ δι' ἀμυδρῶν φασμάτων ὀνειρώττουσιν ἐγχρίμπτειν λεγομένους, εὖ μάλα θρησκεύειν.

[2] Cf. Ex. xx. 3, 4, 5.

driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations." [1]

Chapter vii.

Having, moreover, assumed that the Jews consider the heaven to be God, he adds that this is absurd; finding fault with those who bow down to the heaven, but not also to the sun, and moon, and stars, saying that the Jews do this, as if it were possible that "the whole" should be God, and its several parts not divine. And he seems to call the heaven "a whole," and sun, moon, and stars its several parts. Now, certainly neither Jews nor Christians call the "heaven" God. Let it be granted, however, that, as he alleges, the heaven *is* called God by the Jews, and suppose that sun, moon, and stars *are* parts of "heaven,"—which is by no means true, for neither are the animals and plants upon the earth any portion of it,—how is it true, even according to the opinions of the Greeks, that if God be a whole, His parts also are divine? Certainly they say that the Cosmos taken as the whole[2] is God, the Stoics calling it the First God, the followers of Plato the Second, and some of them the Third. According to these philosophers, then, seeing the whole Cosmos is God, its parts also are divine; so that not only are human beings divine, but the whole of the irrational creation, as being "*portions*" of the Cosmos; and besides these, the plants also are divine. And if the rivers, and mountains, and seas are portions of the Cosmos, then, since the whole Cosmos is God, are the rivers and seas also gods? But this even the Greeks will not assert. Those, however, who preside over rivers and seas (either demons or gods, as they call them), they would term gods. Now from this it follows that the general statement of Celsus, even according to the Greeks, who hold the doctrine of Providence, is false, that if any "whole" be a god, its parts necessarily are divine. But it follows from the doctrine of Celsus, that if the Cosmos be God, all that is in it is divine, being parts of the Cosmos. Now, according to this view, animals, as flies, and gnats, and worms, and every species of serpent, as well as of birds and fishes, will be divine,—an assertion which would not be made even by those

[1] Cf. Deut. iv. 19.

[2] τὸ ὅλον ὁ κόσμος.

who maintain that the Cosmos is God. But the Jews, who live according to the law of Moses, although they may not know how to receive the secret meaning of the law, which is conveyed in obscure language, will not maintain that either the heaven or the angels are God.

Chapter viii.

As we allege, however, that he has fallen into confusion in consequence of false notions which he has imbibed, come and let us point them out to the best of our ability, and show that although Celsus considers it to be a Jewish custom to bow down to the heaven and the angels in it, such a practice is not at all Jewish, but is in violation of Judaism, as it also is to do obeisance to sun, moon, and stars, as well as images. You will find at least in the book of Jeremiah the words of God censuring by the mouth of the prophet the Jewish people for doing obeisance to such objects, and for sacrificing to the queen of heaven, and to all the host of heaven.[1] The writings of the Christians, moreover, show, in censuring the sins committed among the Jews, that when God abandoned that people on account of certain sins, these sins [of idol-worship] also were committed by them. For it is related in the Acts of the Apostles regarding the Jews, that "God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which you made to worship them."[2] And in the writings of Paul, who was carefully trained in Jewish customs, and converted afterwards to Christianity by a miraculous appearance of Jesus, the following words may be read in the Epistle to the Colossians: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the head, from which all the body by joint and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."[3] But Celsus, having neither read

[1] Cf. Jer. vii. 17, 18. [2] Cf. Acts vii. 42, 43. [3] Cf. Col. ii. 18, 19.

these verses, nor having learned their contents from any other source, has represented, I know not how, the Jews as not transgressing their law in bowing down to the heavens, and to the angels therein.

Chapter ix.

And still continuing a little confused, and not taking care to see what was relevant to the matter, he expressed his opinion that the Jews were induced by the incantations employed in jugglery and sorcery (in consequence of which certain phantoms appear, in obedience to the spells employed by the magicians) to bow down to the angels in heaven, not observing that this was contrary to their law, which said to them who practised such observances: "Regard not them which have familiar spirits,[1] neither seek after wizards,[2] to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God."[3] He ought, therefore, either not to have at all attributed this practice to the Jews, seeing he has observed that they keep their law, and has called them "those who live according to their law;" or if he did attribute it, he ought to have shown that the Jews did this in violation of their code. But again, as they transgress their law who offer worship to those who are said to appear to them who are involved in darkness and blinded by sorcery, and who dream dreams, owing to obscure phantoms presenting themselves; so also do they transgress the law who offer sacrifice to sun, moon, and stars.[4] And there is thus great inconsistency in the same individual saying that the Jews are careful to keep their law by not bowing down to sun, and moon, and stars, while they are not so careful to keep it in the matter of heaven and the angels.

Chapter x.

And if it be necessary for us to offer a defence of our refusal to recognise as gods, equally with angels, and sun, and moon, and stars, those who are called by the Greeks "manifest and visible" divinities, we shall answer that the law of Moses knows

[1] ἐγγαστριμύθοις. [2] ἐπαοιδοῖς. [3] Cf. Lev. xix. 31.

[4] The emendations of Ruæus have been adopted in the translation, the text being probably corrupt. Cf. Ruæus, *in loc.*

that these latter have been apportioned by God among all the nations under the heaven, but not amongst those who were selected by God as His chosen people above all the nations of the earth. For it is written in the book of Deuteronomy: "And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldst be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven. But the Lord hath taken us, and brought us forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto Him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day."[1] The Hebrew people, then, being called by God a "chosen generation, and a royal priesthood, and a holy nation, and a purchased people,"[2] regarding whom it was foretold to Abraham by the voice of the Lord addressed to him, "Look now towards heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and He said unto him, So shall thy seed be;"[3] and having thus a hope that they would become as the stars of heaven, were not likely to bow down to those objects which they were to resemble as a result of their understanding and observing the law of God. For it was said to them: "The Lord our God hath multiplied us; and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude."[4] In the book of Daniel, also, the following prophecies are found relating to those who are to share in the resurrection: "And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that has been written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust[5] of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and [those] of the many righteous[6] as the stars for ever and ever,"[7] etc. And hence Paul, too, when speaking of the resurrection, says: "And there are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So

[1] Cf. Deut. iv. 19, 20.
[2] Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9.
[3] Cf. Gen. xv. 5.
[4] Cf. Deut. i. 10.
[5] *χώματι.*
[6] *ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων τῶν πολλῶν.*
[7] Cf. Dan. xii. 1, 2, 3.

also is the resurrection of the dead."[1] It was not therefore consonant to reason that those who had been taught sublimely[2] to ascend above all created things, and to hope for the enjoyment of the most glorious rewards with God on account of their virtuous lives, and who had heard the words, "Ye are the light of the world,"[3] and, "Let your light so shine before men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father who is in heaven,"[4] and who possessed through practice this brilliant and unfading wisdom, or who had secured even the "very reflection of everlasting light,"[5] should be so impressed with the [mere] *visible* light of sun, and moon, and stars, that, on account of that sensible light of theirs, they should deem themselves (although possessed of so great a rational light of knowledge, and of the true light, and the light of the world, and the light of men) to be somehow inferior to them, and to bow down to them; seeing they ought to be worshipped, if they are to receive worship at all, not for the sake of the sensible light which is admired by the multitude, but because of the rational and true light, if indeed the stars in heaven are rational and virtuous beings, and have been illuminated with the light of knowledge by that wisdom which is the "reflection of everlasting light." For that sensible light of theirs is the work of the Creator of all things, while that rational light is derived perhaps from the principle of free-will within them.[6]

Chapter xi.

But even this rational light itself ought not to be worshipped by him who beholds and understands the true light, by sharing in which these also are enlightened; nor by him who beholds God, the Father of the true light,—of whom it has been said, "God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all."[7] Those, indeed, who worship sun, moon, and stars because their light is visible and celestial, would not bow down to a spark of fire or a lamp upon earth, because they see the incomparable superiority of those objects which are deemed worthy of homage to the

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 40–42.
[2] μεγαλοφυῶς.
[3] Matt. v. 14.
[4] Cf. Matt. v. 16.
[5] Cf. Origen, *de Principiis*, i. c. vii.
[6] ἐκ τοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς αὐτεξουσίου ἐλληλυθός.
[7] Cf. 1 John i. 5.

light of sparks and lamps. So those who understand that God is light, and who have apprehended that the Son of God is "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and who comprehend also how He says, "I am the light of the world," would not rationally offer worship to that which is, as it were, a spark in sun, moon, and stars, in comparison with God, who is light of the true light. Nor is it with a view to depreciate these great works of God's creative power, or to call them, after the fashion of Anaxagoras, "fiery masses,"[1] that we thus speak of sun, and moon, and stars; but because we perceive the inexpressible superiority of the divinity of God, and that of His only-begotten Son, which surpasses all other things. And being persuaded that the sun himself, and moon, and stars pray to the Supreme God through His only-begotten Son, we judge it improper to pray to those beings who themselves offer up prayers [to God], seeing even they themselves would prefer that we should send up our requests to the God to whom they pray, rather than send them downwards to themselves, or apportion our power of prayer[2] between God and them. And here I may employ this illustration, as bearing upon this point: Our Lord and Saviour, hearing Himself on one occasion addressed as "Good Master,"[3] referring him who used it to His own Father, said, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God the Father."[4] And since it was in accordance with sound reason that this should be said by the Son of His Father's love, as being the image of the goodness of God, why should not the sun say with greater reason to those that bow down to him, Why do you worship me? "for thou wilt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve;"[5] for it is He whom I and all who are with me serve and worship. And although one may not be so exalted [as the sun], nevertheless let such an one pray to the Word of God (who is able to heal him), and still more to His Father, who also to the righteous of former times "sent His word, and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions."[6]

[1] μύδρον διάπυρον.
[2] τὴν εὐκτικὴν δύναμιν.
[3] Cf. Matt. xix. 17; cf. Mark x. 18.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Cf. Deut. vi. 13.
[6] Cf. Ps. cvii. 20.

Chapter xii.

God accordingly, in His kindness, condescends to mankind, not in any local sense, but through His providence;[1] while the Son of God, not only [when on earth], but at *all* times, is with His own disciples, fulfilling the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world."[2] And if a branch cannot bear fruit except it abide in the vine, it is evident that the disciples also of the Word, who are the rational branches of the Word's true vine, cannot produce the fruits of virtue unless they abide in the true vine, the Christ of God, who is with us locally here below upon the earth, and who is with those who cleave to Him in all parts of the world, and is also in all places with those who do not know Him. Another is made manifest by that John who wrote the Gospel, when, speaking in the person of John the Baptist, he said, "There standeth one among you whom ye know not; He it is who cometh after me."[3] And it is absurd, when He who fills heaven and earth, and who said, "Do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord,"[4] is with us, and near us (for I believe Him when He says, "I am a God nigh at hand, and not afar off, saith the Lord"[5]), to seek to pray to sun or moon, or one of the stars, whose influence does not reach the whole of the world.[6] But, to use the very words of Celsus, let it be granted that "the sun, moon, and stars *do* foretell rain, and heat, and clouds, and thunders," why, then, if they really do foretell such great things, ought we not rather to do homage to God, whose servant they are in uttering these predictions, and show reverence to *Him* rather than His *prophets?* Let them predict, then, the approach of lightnings, and fruits, and all manner of productions, and let all such things be under their administration; yet we shall not on that account worship those who themselves offer worship, as we do not worship even Moses, and those prophets who came from God after him, and who predicted better things than rain, and heat, and clouds, and thunders, and lightnings, and fruits, and all sorts of productions visible to the senses. Nay, even if sun, and

[1] προνοητικῶς. [2] Matt. xxviii. 20. [3] Cf. John i. 26, 27.
[4] Cf. Jer. xxiii. 24. [5] Cf. Jer. xxiii. 23.
[6] ζητεῖν εὔχεσθαι τῷ μὴ φθάνοντι ἐπὶ τὰ σύμπαντα.

moon, and stars were able to prophesy better things than rain, not even then shall we worship *them*, but the *Father* of the prophecies which are in them, and the *Word* of God, their minister. But grant that they are His heralds, and truly messengers of heaven, why, even then ought we not to worship the *God* whom they only proclaim and announce, rather than those who are the *heralds* and *messengers?*

Chapter xiii.

Celsus, moreover, assumes that sun, and moon, and stars are regarded by us as of no account. Now, with regard to these, we acknowledge that they too are "waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God," being for the present subjected to the "vanity" of their material bodies, "by reason of Him who has subjected the same in hope."[1] But if Celsus had read the innumerable other passages where we speak of sun, moon, and stars, and especially these,—"Praise Him, all ye stars, and thou, O light,"[2] and, "Praise Him, ye heaven of heavens,"—he would not have said of us that we regard such mighty beings, which "greatly praise" the Lord God, as of no account. Nor did Celsus know the passage: "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."[3] And with these words let us terminate our defence against the charge of not worshipping sun, moon, and stars. And let us now bring forward those statements of his which follow, that we may, God willing, address to him in reply such arguments as shall be suggested by the light of truth.

Chapter xiv.

The following, then, are his words: "It is folly on their part to suppose that when God, as if He were a cook,[4] introduces the fire [which is to consume the world], all the rest of the human race will be burnt up, while they alone will remain, not

[1] Cf. Rom. viii. 19–21.
[2] Cf. Ps. cxlviii. 3.
[3] Cf. Rom. viii. 19–21.
[4] ὥσπερ μάγειρος.

only such of them as are then alive, but also those who are long since dead, which latter will arise from the earth clothed with the self-same flesh [as during life]; for such a hope is simply one which might be cherished by worms. For what sort of human soul is that which would still long for a body that had been subject to corruption? Whence, also, this opinion of yours is not shared by some of the Christians, and they pronounce it to be exceedingly vile, and loathsome, and impossible; for what kind of body is that which, after being completely corrupted, can return to its original nature, and to that self-same first condition out of which it fell into dissolution? Being unable to return any answer, they betake themselves to a most absurd refuge, viz. that all things are possible to God. And yet God *cannot* do things that are disgraceful, nor does He wish to do things that are contrary to His nature; nor, if (in accordance with the wickedness of your own heart) you desired anything that was evil, would God accomplish it; nor must you believe at once that it will be done. For God does not rule the world in order to satisfy inordinate desires, or to allow disorder and confusion, but to govern a nature that is upright and just.[1] For the *soul*, indeed, He might be able to provide an everlasting life; while dead *bodies*, on the contrary, are, as Heraclitus observes, more worthless than dung. God, however, neither can nor will declare, contrary to all reason, that the flesh, which is full of those things which it is not even honourable to mention, is to exist for ever. For He is the reason of all things that exist, and therefore can do nothing either contrary to reason or contrary to Himself."

Chapter xv.

Observe, now, here at the very beginning, how, in ridiculing the doctrine of a conflagration of the world, held by certain of the Greeks who have treated the subject in a philosophic spirit not to be depreciated, he would make us, "representing God, as it were, as a cook, hold the belief in a general conflagration;" not perceiving that, as certain Greeks were of opinion (perhaps having received their information from the ancient nation of

[1] οὐ γὰρ τῆς πλημμελοῦς ὀρέξεως, οὐδὲ τῆς πεπλανημένης ἀκοσμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας φύσεως Θεός ἐστιν ἀρχηγέτης.

the Hebrews), it is a purificatory fire which is brought upon the world, and probably also on each one of those who stand in need of chastisement by the fire and healing at the same time, seeing it *burns* indeed, but does not *consume*, those who are without a material body,[1] which needs to be consumed by that fire, and which burns and consumes those who by their actions, words, and thoughts have built up wood, or hay, or stubble, in that which is figuratively termed a "building."[2] And the Holy Scriptures say that the Lord will, like a refiner's fire and fuller's soap,[3] visit each one of those who require purification, because of the intermingling in them of a flood of wicked matter proceeding from their evil nature; who need fire, I mean, to refine, as it were, [the dross of] those who are intermingled with copper, and tin, and lead. And he who likes may learn this from the prophet Ezekiel.[4] But that we say that God brings fire upon the world, not like a cook, but like a God, who is the benefactor of them who stand in need of the discipline of fire,[5] will be testified by the prophet Isaiah, in whose writings it is related that a sinful nation was thus addressed: "Because thou hast coals of fire, sit upon them: they shall be to thee a help."[6] Now the Scripture is appropriately adapted to the multitudes of those who are to peruse it, because it speaks obscurely of things that are sad and gloomy,[7] in order to terrify those who cannot by any other means be saved from the flood of their sins, although even then the attentive reader will clearly discover the end that is to be accomplished by these sad and painful punishments upon those who endure them. It is sufficient, however, for the present to quote the words of Isaiah: "For my name's sake will I show mine anger, and my glory I will bring upon thee, that I may not destroy thee."[8] We have thus been under the necessity of referring in obscure terms to questions not fitted to the capacity of simple believers, who require a simpler instruction in words, that we might not appear to leave unrefuted the accusation of Celsus, that "God introduces the fire, [which is to destroy the world], as if He were a cook."

[1] ὕλην. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 12. [3] Cf. Mal. iii. 2.
[4] Cf. Ezek. xxii. 18, 20. [5] πόνου καὶ πυρός. [6] Cf. Isa. xlvii. 14, 15.
[7] τὰ σκυθρωπά. [8] Cf. Isa. xlviii. 9 (Septuagint).

Chapter xvi.

From what has been said, it will be manifest to intelligent hearers how we have to answer the following: "All the rest of the race will be completely burnt up, and they alone will remain." It is not to be wondered at, indeed, if such thoughts have been entertained by those amongst us who are called in Scripture the "foolish things" of the world, and "base things," and "things which are despised," and "things which are not," because "by the foolishness of preaching it pleased God to save them that believe on Him, after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God,"[1]—because such individuals are unable to see distinctly the sense of each particular passage,[2] or unwilling to devote the necessary leisure to the investigation of Scripture, notwithstanding the injunction of Jesus, "Search the Scriptures."[3] The following, moreover, are his ideas regarding the fire which is to be brought upon the world by God, and the punishments which are to befall sinners. And perhaps, as it is appropriate to children that some things should be addressed to them in a manner befitting their infantile condition, to convert them, as being of very tender age, to a better course of life; so, to those whom the word terms "the foolish things of the world," and "the base," and "the despised," the just and obvious meaning of the passages relating to punishments is suitable, inasmuch as they cannot receive any other mode of conversion than that which is by fear and the presentation of punishment, and thus be saved from the many evils [which would befall them].[4] The Scripture accordingly declares that only those who are unscathed by the fire and the punishments are to remain,—those, viz., whose opinions, and morals, and mind have been purified to the highest degree; while, on the other hand, those of a different nature—those, viz., who, according to their deserts, require the administration of punishment by fire—will be involved in these sufferings with a view to an end which it is suitable for God to bring upon those who have been created in His image, but who have lived in opposition to the will of that nature which

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 21.
[2] τὰ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους.
[3] Cf. John v. 39.
[4] καὶ τῶν πολλῶν κακῶν ἀποχήν.

is according to His image. And this is our answer to the statement, "All the rest of the race will be completely burnt up, but they alone are to remain."

Chapter xvii.

Then, in the next place, having either himself misunderstood the sacred Scriptures, or those [interpreters] by whom they were not understood, he proceeds to assert that "it is said by us that there will remain at the time of the visitation which is to come upon the world by the fire of purification, not only those who are then alive, but also those who are long ago dead;" not observing that it is with a secret kind of wisdom that it was said by the apostle of Jesus: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."[1] Now he ought to have noticed what was the meaning of him who uttered these words, as being one who was by no means dead, who made a distinction between himself and those like him and the dead, and who said afterwards, "The dead shall be raised incorruptible," and "we shall be changed." And as a proof that such was the apostle's meaning in writing those words which I have quoted from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, I will quote also from the First to the Thessalonians, in which Paul, as one who is alive and awake, and different from those who are asleep, speaks as follows: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them who are asleep; for the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God."[2] Then, again, after this, knowing that there were others dead in Christ besides himself and such as he, he subjoins the words, "The dead in Christ shall rise first; then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."[3]

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.
[2] Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15, 16.
[3] Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

Chapter xviii.

But since he has ridiculed at great length the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, which has been preached in the churches, and which is more clearly understood by the more intelligent believer; and as it is unnecessary again to quote his words, which have been already adduced, let us, with regard to the problem[1] (as in an apologetic work directed against an alien from the faith, and for the sake of those who are still "children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive"[2]), state and establish to the best of our ability a few points expressly intended for our readers. Neither we, then, nor the Holy Scriptures, assert that with the same bodies, without a change to a higher condition, "shall those who were long dead arise from the earth and live again;" for in so speaking, Celsus makes a false charge against us. For we may listen to many passages of Scripture treating of the resurrection in a manner worthy of God, although it may suffice for the present to quote the language of Paul from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says: "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body."[3] Now, observe how in these words he says that there is sown, "not that body that shall be;" but that of the body which is sown and cast naked into the earth (God giving to each seed its own body), there takes place as it were a resurrection: from the seed that was cast into the ground there arising a stalk, *e.g.* among such plants as the following, viz. the mustard plant, or of a larger tree, as in the olive,[4] or one of the fruit-trees.

Chapter xix.

God, then, gives to each thing its own body as He pleases:

[1] περὶ τοῦ προβλήματος τούτου.
[2] Cf. Eph. iv. 14.
[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 35–38.
[4] ἐν ἐλαίας πυρῆνι.

as in the case of plants that are sown, so also in the case of those beings who are, as it were, sown in dying, and who in due time receive, out of what has been "sown," the body assigned by God to each one according to his deserts. And we may hear, moreover, the Scripture teaching us at great length the difference between that which is, as it were, "sown," and that which is, as it were, "raised" from it, in these words: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."[1] And let him who has the capacity understand the meaning of the words: "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."[2] And although the apostle wished to conceal the secret meaning of the passage, which was not adapted to the simpler class of believers, and to the understanding of the common people, who are led by their faith to enter on a better course of life, he was nevertheless obliged afterwards to say (in order that we might not misapprehend his meaning), after "Let us bear the image of the heavenly," these words also: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."[3] Then, knowing that there was a secret and mystical meaning in the passage, as was becoming in one who was leaving, in his epistles, to those who were to come after him words full of significance, he subjoins the following, "Behold, I show you a mystery;"[4] which is his usual style in introducing matters of a profounder and more mystical nature, and such as are fittingly concealed from the multitude, as is written in the book of Tobit: "It is good to keep close the secret of a king, but honourable to reveal the works of God,"[5]—in a way consistent with truth and God's glory, and so as to be to the advantage of the multitude. Our hope, then, is *not* "the hope of worms, nor does our soul long for a body that has seen corruption;" for although it may

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 43.
[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 48, 49.
[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 49.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50.
[5] Cf. Tobit xii. 7.

require a body, for the sake of moving from place to place,[1] yet it understands (as having meditated on the wisdom [that is from above], agreeably to the declaration, "The mouth of the righteous will speak wisdom"[2]) the difference between the "earthly house," in which is the tabernacle of the building that is to be dissolved, and that in which the righteous do groan, being burdened,—not wishing to "put off" the tabernacle, but to be "clothed therewith," that by being clothed upon, mortality might be swallowed up of life. For, in virtue of the whole nature of the body being corruptible, the corruptible tabernacle must put on incorruption; and its other part, being mortal, and becoming liable to the death which follows sin, must put on immortality, in order that, when the corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality, then shall come to pass what was predicted of old by the prophets,—the annihilation of the "victory" of death (because it had conquered and subjected us to his sway), and of its "sting," with which it stings the imperfectly defended soul, and inflicts upon it the wounds which result from sin.

Chapter xx.

But since our views regarding the resurrection have, as far as time would permit, been stated in part on the present occasion (for we have systematically examined the subject in greater detail in other parts of our writings); and as now we must by means of sound reasoning refute the fallacies of Celsus, who neither understands the meaning of our Scripture, nor has the capacity of judging that the meaning of our wise men is not to be determined by those individuals who make no profession of anything more than of a [simple] faith in the Christian system, let us show that men, not to be lightly esteemed on account of their reasoning powers and dialectic subtleties, have given expression to very absurd[3] opinions. And if we must sneer[4] at them as contemptible old wives' fables, it is at them rather than at our narrative that we must sneer. The disciples of the Porch assert, that after a period of years there will be a conflagration of the world, and after that an arrange-

[1] διὰ τὰς τοπικὰς μεταβάσεις.
[2] Cf. Ps. xxxvii. 30.
[3] σφόδρ' ἀπεμφαίνοντα.
[4] μυχθίζειν.

ment of things in which everything will be unchanged, as compared with the former arrangement of the world. Those of them, however, who evinced their respect for this doctrine have said that there will be a change, although exceedingly slight, at the end of the cycle, from what prevailed during the preceding. And these men maintain, that in the succeeding cycle the same things will occur, and Socrates will be again the son of Sophroniscus, and a native of Athens; and Phænarete, being married to Sophroniscus, will again become his mother. And although they do not mention the word "resurrection," they show in reality that Socrates, who derived his origin from seed, will spring from that of Sophroniscus, and will be fashioned in the womb of Phænarete; and being brought up at Athens, will practise the study of philosophy, as if his former philosophy had arisen again, and were to be in no respect different from what it was before. Anytus and Melitus, too, will arise again as accusers of Socrates, and the Council of Areopagus will condemn him to death! But what is more ridiculous still, is that Socrates will clothe himself with garments not at all different from those which he wore during the former cycle, and will live in the same unchanged state of poverty, and in the same unchanged city of Athens! And Phalaris will again play the tyrant, and his brazen bull will pour forth its bellowings from the voices of victims within, unchanged from those who were condemned in the former cycle! And Alexander of Pheræ, too, will again act the tyrant with a cruelty unaltered from the former time, and will condemn to death the same "unchanged" individuals as before. But what need is there to go into detail upon the doctrine held by the Stoic philosophers on such things, and which escapes the ridicule of Celsus, and is perhaps even venerated by him, since he regards Zeno as a wiser man than Jesus?

Chapter xxi.

The disciples of Pythagoras, too, and of Plato, although they appear to hold the incorruptibility of the world, yet fall into similar errors. For as the planets, after certain definite cycles, assume the same positions, and hold the same relations to one another, all things on earth will, they assert, be like what they

were at the time when the same state of planetary relations existed in the world. From this view it necessarily follows, that when, after the lapse of a lengthened cycle, the planets come to occupy towards each other the same relations which they occupied in the time of Socrates, Socrates will again be born of the same parents, and suffer the same treatment, being accused by Anytus and Melitus, and condemned by the Council of Areopagus! The learned among the Egyptians, moreover, hold similar views, and yet they are treated with respect, and do not incur the ridicule of Celsus and such as he; while we, who maintain that all things are administered by God in proportion to the relation of the free-will of each individual, and are ever being brought into a better condition, so far as they admit of being so,[1] and who know that the nature of our free-will admits of the occurrence of contingent events[2] (for it is incapable of receiving the wholly unchangeable character of God), yet do not appear to say anything worthy of a testing examination.

Chapter xxii.

Let no one, however, suspect that, in speaking as we do, we belong to those who are indeed called Christians, but who set aside the doctrine of the resurrection as it is taught in Scripture. For these persons cannot, so far as their principles apply, at all establish that the stalk or tree which springs up comes from the grain of wheat, or anything else [which was cast into the ground]; whereas we, who believe that that which is "sown" is not "quickened" unless it die, and that there is sown not that body that shall be (for God gives it a body as it pleases Him, raising it in incorruption after it is sown in corruption; and after it is sown in dishonour, raising it in glory; and after it is sown in weakness, raising it in power; and after it is sown a natural body, raising it a spiritual), —we preserve both the doctrine[3] of the church of Christ and the grandeur of the divine promise, proving also the possibility of its accomplishment not by mere assertion, but by arguments; knowing that although heaven and earth, and the things that

[1] *κατὰ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον.*

[2] *καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν Φύσιν γιγνώσκοντες ἐνδεχομένου ἃ ἐνδέχεται.*

[3] *βούλημα.*

are in them, may pass away, yet His words regarding each individual thing, being, as parts of a whole, or species of a genus, the utterances of Him who was God the Word, who was in the beginning with God, shall by no means pass away. For we desire to listen to Him who said: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."[1]

Chapter xxiii.

We, therefore, do not maintain that the body which has undergone corruption resumes its original nature, any more than the grain of wheat which has decayed returns to its former condition. But we do maintain, that as above the grain of wheat there arises a stalk, so a certain power[2] is implanted in the body, which is not destroyed, and from which the body is raised up in incorruption. The philosophers of the Porch, however, in consequence of the opinions which they hold regarding the unchangeableness of things after a certain cycle, assert that the body, after undergoing complete corruption, will return to its original condition, and will again assume that first nature from which it passed into a state of dissolution, establishing these points, as they think, by irresistible arguments.[3] We, however, do not betake ourselves to a most absurd refuge, saying that with God *all* things are possible; for we know how to understand this word "all" as not referring either to things that are "non-existent" or that are inconceivable. But we maintain, at the same time, that God cannot do what is disgraceful, since then He would be capable of ceasing to be God; for if He do anything that is disgraceful, He is not God. Since, however, he lays it down as a principle, that "God does not desire what is contrary to nature," we have to make a distinction, and say that if any one asserts that wickedness is contrary to nature, while we maintain that "God does not desire what is contrary to nature,"—either what springs from wickedness or from an irrational principle,—yet, if such things happen according to the word and will of God, we must at once necessarily hold that they are not contrary to nature. Therefore things which are done by God, although they may be, or may *appear* to some to

[1] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 35; cf. Mark xiii. 31.

[2] λόγος. [3] διαλεκτικαῖς ἀνάγκαις.

be incredible, are not contrary to nature. And if we must press the force of words,[1] we would say that, in comparison with what is generally understood as "nature," there *are* certain things which are *beyond* its power, which God could at any time do; as, *e.g.*, in raising man above the level of human nature, and causing him to pass into a better and more divine condition, and preserving him in the same, so long as he who is the object of His care shows by his actions that he desires [the continuance of His help].

Chapter xxiv.

Moreover, as we have already said that for God to desire anything unbecoming Himself would be destructive of His existence as Deity, we will add that if man, agreeably to the wickedness of his nature, should desire anything that is abominable,[2] God cannot grant it. And now it is from no spirit of contention that we answer the assertions of Celsus; but it is in the spirit of truth that we investigate them, as assenting to his view that "He is the God, not of inordinate desires, nor of error and disorder, but of a nature just and upright," because He is the source of all that is good. And that He is able to provide an eternal life for the soul we acknowledge; and that He possesses not only the "power," but the "will." In view, therefore, of these considerations, we are not at all distressed by the assertion of Heraclitus, adopted by Celsus, that "dead bodies are to be cast out as more worthless than dung;" and yet, with reference even to this, one might say that dung, indeed, ought to be cast out, while the dead bodies of men, on account of the soul by which they were inhabited, especially if it had been virtuous, ought not to be cast out. For, in harmony with those laws which are based upon the principles of equity, bodies are deemed worthy of sepulture, with the honours accorded on such occasions, that no insult, so far as can be helped, may be offered to the soul which dwelt within, by casting forth the body (after the soul has departed) like that of the animals. Let it not then be held, contrary to reason, that it is the will of God to declare that the grain of wheat is not immortal, but the stalk which springs from it, while the body which is sown in corruption is not, but that which is raised by Him in incorruption. But

[1] εἰ δὲ χρὴ βεβιασμένως ὀνομάσαι. [2] βδέλυρον.

according to Celsus, God Himself is the reason of all things, while according to our view it is His Son, of whom we say in philosophic language, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;"[1] while in our judgment also, God cannot do anything which is contrary to reason, or contrary to Himself.

Chapter xxv.

Let us next notice the statements of Celsus, which follow the preceding, and which are as follow: "As the Jews, then, became a peculiar people, and enacted laws in keeping with the customs of their country,[2] and maintain them up to the present time, and observe a mode of worship which, whatever be its nature, is yet derived from their fathers, they act in these respects like other men, because each nation retains its ancestral customs, whatever they are, if they happen to be established among them. And such an arrangement appears to be advantageous, not only because it has occurred to the mind of other nations to decide some things differently, but also because it is a duty to protect what has been established for the public advantage; and also because, in all probability, the various quarters of the earth were from the beginning allotted to different superintending spirits,[3] and were thus distributed among certain governing powers,[4] and in this manner the administration of the world is carried on. And whatever is done among each nation in this way would be rightly done, wherever it was agreeable to the wishes [of the superintending powers], while it would be an act of impiety to get rid of[5] the institutions established from the beginning in the various places." By these words Celsus shows that the Jews, who were formerly Egyptians, subsequently became a "peculiar people," and enacted laws which they carefully preserve. And not to repeat his statements, which have been already before us, he says that it is advantageous to the Jews to observe their ancestral worship, as other nations carefully attend to theirs. And he further states a deeper reason why it is of advantage to the Jews to cultivate their ancestral

[1] Cf. John i. 1.

[2] *καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιχώριον νόμους θέμενοι.*

[3] *τὰ μέρη τῆς γῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄλλα ἄλλοις ἐπόπταις νενεμημένα.*

[4] *καὶ κατά τινας ἐπικρατείας διειλημμένα.*

[5] *παραλύειν.*

customs, in hinting dimly that those to whom was allotted the office of superintending the country which was being legislated for, enacted the laws of each land in co-operation with its legislators. He appears, then, to indicate that both the country of the Jews, and the nation which inhabits it, are superintended by one or more beings, who, whether they were one or more, co-operated with Moses, and enacted the laws of the Jews.

Chapter xxvi.

"We must," he says, "observe the laws, not only because it has occurred to the mind of others to decide some things differently, but because it is a duty to protect what has been enacted for the public advantage, and also because, in all probability, the various quarters of the earth were from the beginning allotted to different superintending spirits, and were distributed among certain governing powers, and in this manner the administration of the world is carried on." Thus Celsus, as if he had forgotten what he had said against the Jews, now includes them in the general eulogy which he passes upon all who observe their ancestral customs, remarking: "And whatever is done among each nation in this way, would be rightly done whenever agreeable to the wishes [of the superintendents]." And observe here, whether he does not openly, so far as he can, express a wish that the Jew should live in the observance of his own laws, and not depart from them, because he would commit an act of impiety if he apostatized; for his words are: "It would be an act of impiety to get rid of the institutions established from the beginning in the various places." Now I should like to ask him, and those who entertain his views, who it was that distributed the various quarters of the earth from the beginning among the different superintending spirits; and especially, who gave the country of the Jews, and the Jewish people themselves, to the one or more superintendents to whom it was allotted? Was it, as Celsus would say, Jupiter who assigned the Jewish people and their country to a certain spirit or spirits? And was it *his* wish, to whom they were thus assigned, to enact among them the laws which prevail, or was it *against* his will that it was done? You will observe that, whatever be his answer, he is in a strait. But if the various

quarters of the earth were *not* allotted by some one being to the various superintending spirits, then each one at random, and without the superintendence of a higher power, divided the earth according to chance; and yet such a view is absurd, and destructive in no small degree of the providence of the God who presides over all things.

Chapter xxvii.

Any one, indeed, who chooses, may relate how the various quarters of the earth, being distributed among certain governing powers, are administered by those who superintend them; but let him tell us also how what is done among each nation is done rightly when agreeable to the wishes of the superintendents. Let him, for example, tell us whether the laws of the Scythians, which permit the murder of parents, are right laws; or those of the Persians, which do not forbid the marriages of sons with their mothers, or of daughters with their own fathers. But what need is there for me to make selections from those who have been engaged in the business of enacting laws among the different nations, and to inquire how the laws are rightly enacted among each, according as they please the superintending powers? Let Celsus, however, tell us how it would be an act of impiety to get rid of those ancestral laws which permit the marriages of mothers and daughters; or which pronounce a man happy who puts an end to his life by hanging, or declare that they undergo entire purification who deliver themselves over to the fire, and who terminate their existence by fire; and how it is an act of impiety to do away with those laws which, for example, prevail in the Tauric Chersonese, regarding the offering up of strangers in sacrifice to Diana, or among certain of the Libyan tribes regarding the sacrifice of children to Saturn. Moreover, this inference follows from the dictum of Celsus, that it is an act of impiety on the part of the Jews to do away with those ancestral laws which forbid the worship of any other deity than the Creator of all things. And it will follow, according to his view, that piety is not divine by its own nature, but by a certain [external] arrangement and appointment. For it is an act of piety among certain tribes to worship a crocodile, and to eat what is an

object of adoration among other tribes; while, again, with others it is a pious act to worship a calf, and among others, again, to regard the goat as a god. And, in this way, the same individual will be regarded as acting piously according to one set of laws, and impiously according to another; and this is the most absurd result that can be conceived!

Chapter xxviii.

It is probable, however, that to such remarks as the above, the answer returned would be, that he was pious who kept the laws of his *own* country, and not at all chargeable with impiety for the non-observance of those of *other* lands; and that, again, he who was deemed guilty of impiety among certain nations was not really so, when he worshipped his own gods, agreeably to his country's laws, although he made war against, and even feasted on,[1] those who were regarded as divinities among those nations which possessed laws of an opposite kind. Now, observe here whether these statements do not exhibit the greatest confusion of mind regarding the nature of what is just, and holy, and religious; since there is no accurate definition laid down of these things, nor are they described as having a peculiar character of their own, and stamping as religious those who act according to their injunctions. If, then, religion, and piety, and righteousness belong to those things which are so only by comparison, so that the same act may be both pious and impious, according to different relations and different laws, see whether it will not follow that temperance[2] also is a thing of comparison, and courage as well, and prudence, and the other virtues, than which nothing could be more absurd! What we have said, however, is sufficient for the more general and simple class of answers to the allegations of Celsus. But as we think it likely that some of those who are accustomed to deeper investigation will fall in with this treatise, let us venture to lay down some considerations of a profounder kind, conveying a mystical and secret view respecting the original distribution of the various quarters of the earth among different superintending spirits; and let us prove to the best of our ability, that our doctrine is free from the absurd consequences enumerated above.

[1] καταθοινᾶται. [2] σωφροσύνη

Chapter xxix.

It appears to me, indeed, that Celsus has misunderstood some of the deeper reasons relating to the arrangement of terrestrial affairs, some of which are touched upon[1] even in Grecian history, when certain of those who are considered to be gods are introduced as having contended with each other about the possession of Attica; while in the writings of the Greek poets also, some who are called gods are represented as acknowledging that certain places here are preferred by them[2] before others. The history of barbarian nations, moreover, and especially that of Egypt, contains some such allusions to the division of the so-called Egyptian nomes, when it states that Athena, who obtained Saïs by lot, is the same who also has possession of Attica. And the learned among the Egyptians can enumerate innumerable instances of this kind, although I do not know whether they include the Jews and their country in this division. And now, so far as testimonies outside the word of God bearing on this point are concerned, enough have been adduced for the present. We say, moreover, that our prophet of God and His genuine servant Moses, in his song in the book of Deuteronomy, makes a statement regarding the portioning out of the earth in the following terms: "When the Most High divided the nations, when He dispersed the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God; and the Lord's portion was His people Jacob, and Israel the cord of His inheritance."[3] And regarding the distribution of the nations, the same Moses, in his work entitled Genesis, thus expresses himself in the style of a historical narrative: "And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech; and it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there."[4] A little further on he continues: "And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men had built. And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they have begun to do: and now nothing will be restrained from

[1] ἐφάπτεται.
[2] οἰκειοτέρους.
[3] Cf. Deut. xxxii. 8, 9 (LXX.).
[4] Cf. Gen. xi. 1, 2.

them which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. And the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city and the tower. Therefore is the name of it called Confusion;[1] because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."[2] In the treatise of Solomon, moreover, on "Wisdom," and on the events at the time of the confusion of languages, when the division of the earth took place, we find the following regarding Wisdom: "Moreover, the nations in their wicked conspiracy being confounded, she found out the righteous, and preserved him blameless unto God, and kept him strong in his tender compassion towards his son."[3] But on these subjects much, and that of a mystical kind, might be said; in keeping with which is the following: "It is good to keep close the secret of a king,"[4]—in order that the doctrine of the entrance of souls into bodies (not, however, that of the transmigration from one body into another) may not be thrown before the common understanding, nor what is holy given to the dogs, nor pearls be cast before swine. For such a procedure would be impious, being equivalent to a betrayal of the mysterious declarations of God's wisdom, of which it has been well said: "Into a malicious soul wisdom shall not enter, nor dwell in a body subject to sin."[5] It is sufficient, however, to represent in the style of a historic narrative what is intended to convey a secret meaning in the garb of history, that those who have the capacity may work out for themselves all that relates to the subject.

Chapter xxx.

[The narrative, then, may be understood as follows.] All the people upon the earth are to be regarded as having used one divine language, and so long as they lived harmoniously together were preserved in the use of this divine language, and they remained without moving from the east so long as

[1] σύγχυσις. [2] Cf. Gen. xi. 5–9. [3] Cf. Wisd. of Sol. x. 5.
[4] Cf. Tobit xii. 7. [5] Cf. Wisd. of Sol. i. 4.

they were imbued with the sentiments of the "light," and of the "reflection" of the eternal light.[1] But when they departed from the east, and began to entertain sentiments alien to those of the east,[2] they found a place in the land of Shinar (which, when interpreted, means "gnashing of teeth," by way of indicating symbolically that they had lost the means of their support), and in it they took up their abode. Then, desiring to gather together material things,[3] and to join to heaven what had no natural affinity for it, that by means of material things they might conspire against such as were immaterial, they said, "Come, let us make bricks, and burn them with fire." Accordingly, when they had hardened and compacted these materials of clay and matter, and had shown their desire to make brick into stone, and clay into bitumen, and by these means to build a city and a tower, the head of which was, at least in their conception, to reach up to the heavens, after the manner of the "high things which exalt themselves against the knowledge of God," each one was handed over (in proportion to the greater or less departure from the east which had taken place among them, and in proportion to the extent in which bricks had been converted into stones, and clay into bitumen, and building carried on out of these materials) to angels of character more or less severe, and of a nature more or less stern, until they had paid the penalty of their daring deeds; and they were conducted by those angels, who imprinted on each his native language, to the different parts of the earth according to their deserts: some, for example, to a region of burning heat, others to a country which chastises its inhabitants by its cold; others, again, to a land exceedingly difficult of cultivation, others to one less so in degree; while a fifth were brought into a land filled with wild beasts, and a sixth to a country comparatively free of these.

Chapter xxxi.

Now, in the next place, if any one has the capacity, let him understand that in what assumes the form of history, and which contains some things that are literally true, while yet it conveys

[1] ἐς ὅσον εἰσὶ τὰ τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ φωτὸς ἀϊδίου ἀπαυγάσματος φρονοῦντες. [2] ἀλλότρια ἀνατολῶν φρονοῦντες. [3] τὰ τῆς ὕλης.

a deeper meaning, those who preserved their original language continued, by reason of their not having migrated from the east, in possession of the east, and of their eastern language. And let him notice, that these alone became the portion of the Lord, and His people who were called Jacob, and Israel the cord of His inheritance; and these alone were governed by a ruler who did not receive those who were placed under him for the purpose of punishment, as was the case with the others. Let him also, who has the capacity to perceive as far as mortals may, observe that in the body politic[1] of those who were assigned to the Lord as His pre-eminent portion, sins were committed, first of all, such as might be forgiven, and of such a nature as not to make the sinner worthy of entire desertion, while subsequently they became more numerous, though still of a nature to be pardoned. And while remarking that this state of matters continued for a considerable time, and that a remedy was always applied, and that after certain intervals these persons returned to their duty, let him notice that they were given over, in proportion to their transgressions, to those to whom had been assigned the other quarters of the earth; and that, after being at first slightly punished, and having made atonement,[2] they returned, as if they had undergone discipline,[3] to their proper habitations. Let him notice also that afterwards they were delivered over to rulers of a severer character—to Assyrians and Babylonians, as the Scriptures would call them. In the next place, notwithstanding that means of healing were being applied, let him observe that they were still multiplying their transgressions, and that they were on that account dispersed into other regions by the rulers of the nations that oppressed them. And their own ruler intentionally overlooked their oppression at the hands of the rulers of the other nations, in order that he also with good reason, as avenging himself, having obtained power to tear away from the other nations as many as he can, may do so, and enact for them laws, and point out a manner of life agreeably to which they ought to live, that so he may conduct them to the end to which those of the former people were conducted who did not commit sin.

[1] πολιτείᾳ. [2] καὶ τίσαντας δίκην. [3] ὡσπερεὶ παιδευθέντας.

Chapter xxxii.

And by this means let those who have the capacity of comprehending truths so profound, learn that he to whom were allotted those who had not formerly sinned is far more powerful than the others, since he has been able to make a selection of individuals from the portion of the whole,[1] and to separate them from those who received them for the purpose of punishment, and to bring them under the influence of laws, and of a mode of life which helps to produce an oblivion of their former transgressions. But, as we have previously observed, these remarks are to be understood as being made by us with a concealed meaning, by way of pointing out the mistakes of those who asserted that "the various quarters of the earth were from the beginning distributed among different superintending spirits, and being allotted among certain governing powers, were administered in this way;" from which statement Celsus took occasion to make the remarks referred to. But since those who wandered away from the east were delivered over, on account of their sins, to "a reprobate mind," and to "vile affections," and to "uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts,"[2] in order that, being sated with sin, they might hate it, we shall refuse our assent to the assertion of Celsus, that "because of the superintending spirits distributed among the different parts of the earth, what is done among each nation is rightly done;" for our desire is to do what is *not* agreeable to these spirits.[3] For we see that it is a religious act to do away with the customs originally established in the various places by means of laws of a better and more divine character, which were enacted by Jesus, as one possessed of the greatest power, who has rescued us "from the present evil world," and "from the princes of the world that come to nought;" and that it is a mark of irreligion not to throw ourselves at the feet of Him who has manifested Himself to be holier and more powerful than all other rulers, and to whom God said, as the prophets many generations before predicted: "Ask of me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of

[1] ἀπὸ τῆς πάντων μερίδος. [2] Cf. Rom. i. 24, 26, 28.

[3] ἀλλὰ καὶ βουλόμεθα, οὐχ ὅπη ᾖ ἐκείνοις φίλον, ποιεῖν τὰ ἐκείνων.

the earth for Thy possession."[1] For He, too, has become the "expectation" of us who from among the heathen have believed upon Him, and upon His Father, who is God over all things.

Chapter xxxiii.

The remarks which we have made not only answer the statements of Celsus regarding the superintending spirits, but anticipate in some measure what he afterwards brings forward, when he says: "Let the second party come forward; and I shall ask them whence they come, and whom they regard as the originator of their ancestral customs. They will reply, No one, because they spring from the same source as the Jews themselves, and derive their instruction and superintendence[2] from no other quarter, and notwithstanding they have revolted from the Jews." Each one of us, then, is come "in the last days," when one Jesus has visited us, to the "visible mountain of the Lord," the Word that is above every word, and to the "house of God," which is "the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."[3] And we notice how it is built upon "the tops of the mountains," *i.e.* the predictions of all the prophets, which are its foundations. And this house is exalted above the hills, *i.e.* those individuals among men who make a profession of superior attainments in wisdom and truth; and all the nations come to it, and the "many nations" go forth, and say to one another, turning to the religion which in the last days has shone forth through Jesus Christ: "Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in them."[4] For the law came forth from the dwellers in Sion, and settled among us as a spiritual law. Moreover, the word of the Lord came forth from that very Jerusalem, that it might be disseminated through all places, and might judge in the midst of the heathen, selecting those whom it sees to be submissive, and rejecting[5] the disobedient, who are many in number. And to those who inquire of us whence we come, or who is our founder,[6] we reply that we are come, agreeably to the counsels of Jesus, to "cut down our hostile and inso-

[1] Ps. ii. 8.
[2] χοροστάτην.
[3] Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[4] Cf. Isa. ii. 3.
[5] ἐλέγχῃ.
[6] ἀρχηγέτην.

lent 'wordy'[1] swords into ploughshares, and to convert into pruning-hooks the spears formerly employed in war."[2] For we no longer take up "sword against nation," nor do we "learn war any more," having become children of peace, for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader, instead of those whom our fathers followed, among whom we were "strangers to the covenant," and having received a law, for which we give thanks to Him that rescued us from the error [of our ways], saying, "Our fathers honoured lying idols, and there is not among them one that causeth it to rain."[3] Our Superintendent, then, and Teacher, having come forth from the Jews, regulates the whole world by the word of His teaching. And having made these remarks by way of anticipation, we have refuted as well as we could the untrue statements of Celsus, by subjoining the appropriate answer.

Chapter xxxiv.

But, that we may not pass without notice what Celsus has said between these and the preceding paragraphs, let us quote his words: "We might adduce Herodotus as a witness on this point, for he expresses himself as follows: 'For the people of the cities Marea and Apis, who inhabit those parts of Egypt that are adjacent to Libya, and who look upon themselves as Libyans, and not as Egyptians, finding their sacrificial worship oppressive, and wishing not to be excluded from the use of cows' flesh, sent to the oracle of Jupiter Ammon, saying that there was no relationship between them and the Egyptians, that they dwelt outside the Delta, that there was no community of sentiment between them and the Egyptians, and that they wished to be allowed to partake of all kinds of food. But the god would not allow them to do as they desired, saying that that country was a part of Egypt, which was watered by the inundation of the Nile, and that those were Egyptians who dwell

[1] *συγκόψαι τὰς πολεμικὰς ἡμῶν λογικὰς μαχαίρας καὶ ὑβριστικὰς εἰς ἄροτρα, καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὸ πρότερον ἡμῶν μάχιμον ζιβύνας εἰς δρέπανα μετασκευάζομεν.*

[2] Cf. Isa. ii. 4.

[3] Cf. Jer. xvi. 19 and xiv. 22; *ὡς ψευδῆ ἐκτήσαντο οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν εἴδωλα, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὑετίζων.*

to the south of the city of Elephantine, and drink of the river Nile.'[1] Such is the narrative of Herodotus. But," continues Celsus, "Ammon in divine things would not make a worse ambassador than the angels of the Jews,[2] so that there is nothing wrong in each nation observing its established method of worship. Of a truth, we shall find very great differences prevailing among the nations, and yet each seems to deem its own by far the best. Those inhabitants of Ethiopia who dwell in Meroe worship Jupiter and Bacchus alone; the Arabians, Urania and Bacchus only; all the Egyptians, Opus and Isis; the Saïtes, Minerva; while the Naucratites have recently classed Serapis among their deities, and the rest according to their respective laws. And some abstain from the flesh of sheep, and others from that of crocodiles; others, again, from that of cows, while they regard swine's flesh with loathing. The Scythians, indeed, regard it as a noble act to banquet upon human beings. Among the Indians, too, there are some who deem themselves discharging a holy duty in eating their fathers, and this is mentioned in a certain passage by Herodotus. For the sake of credibility, I shall again quote his very words, for he writes as follows: 'For if any one were to make this proposal to all men, viz. to bid him select out of all existing laws the best, each would choose, after examination, those of his own country. Men each consider their own laws much the best, and therefore it is not likely that any other than a madman would make these things a subject of ridicule. But that such are the conclusions of all men regarding the laws, may be determined by many other evidences, and especially by the following illustration. Darius, during his reign, having summoned before him those Greeks who happened to be present at the time, inquired of them for how much they would be willing to eat their deceased fathers; their answer was, that for no consideration would they do such a thing. After this, Darius summoned those Indians who are called Callatians, who are in the habit of eating their parents, and asked of them in the presence of these Greeks, who learned what passed through an interpreter, for what

[1] Cf. Herodot. ii. 18.

[2] ὁ δὲ Ἄμμων οὐδέν τι κακίων διαπρεσβεῦσαι τὰ δαιμόνια, ἢ οἱ Ἰουδαίων ἄγγελοι.

amount of money they would undertake to burn their deceased fathers with fire; on which they raised a loud shout, and bade the king say no more.'[1] Such is the way, then, in which these matters are regarded. And Pindar appears to me to be right in saying that 'law' is the king of all things."[2]

Chapter xxxv.

The argument of Celsus appears to point by these illustrations to this conclusion: that it is "an obligation incumbent on all men to live according to their country's customs, in which case they will escape censure; whereas the Christians, who have abandoned their native usages, and who are not one nation like the Jews, are to be blamed for giving their adherence to the teaching of Jesus." Let him then tell us whether it is a becoming thing for philosophers, and those who have been taught not to yield to superstition, to abandon their country's customs, so as to eat of those articles of food which are prohibited in their respective cities? or whether this proceeding of theirs is opposed to what is becoming? For if, on account of their philosophy, and the instructions which they have received against superstition, they should eat, in disregard of their native laws, what was interdicted by their fathers, why should the Christians (since the gospel requires *them* not to busy themselves about statues and images, or even about any of the created works of God, but to ascend on high, and present the soul to the Creator), when acting in a similar manner to the philosophers, be censured for so doing? But if, for the sake of defending the theses which he has proposed to himself, Celsus, or those who think with him, should say, that even one who had studied philosophy would keep his country's laws, then philosophers in Egypt, for example, would act most ridiculously in avoiding the eating of onions, in order to observe their country's laws, or certain parts of the body, as the head and shoulders, in order not to transgress the traditions of their fathers. And I do not speak of those Egyptians who shudder with fear at the discharge of wind from the body, because if any one of these were to become a philosopher, and still observe the laws of his country, he would be a ridiculous philosopher,

[1] εὐφημεῖν μὲν ἐκέλευον. [2] Cf. Herodot. iii. 38.

acting very unphilosophically.[1] In the same way, then, he who has been led by the gospel to worship the God of all things, and, from regard to his country's laws, lingers here below among images and statues of men, and does not desire to ascend to the Creator, will resemble those who have indeed learned philosophy, but who are afraid of things which ought to inspire no terrors, and who regard it as an act of impiety to eat of those things which have been enumerated.

Chapter xxxvi.

But what sort of being is this Ammon of Herodotus, whose words Celsus has quoted, as if by way of demonstrating how each one ought to keep his country's laws? For this Ammon would not allow the people of the cities of Marea and Apis, who inhabit the districts adjacent to Libya, to treat as a matter of indifference the use of cows' flesh, which is a thing not only indifferent in its own nature, but which does not prevent a man from being noble and virtuous. If Ammon, then, forbade the use of cows' flesh, because of the advantage which results from the use of the animal in the cultivation of the ground, and in addition to this, because it is by the female that the breed is increased, the account would possess more plausibility. But now he simply requires that those who drink of the Nile should observe the laws of the Egyptians regarding kine. And hereupon Celsus, taking occasion to pass a jest upon the employment of the angels among the Jews as the ambassadors of God, says that "Ammon did not make a worse ambassador of divine things than did the angels of the Jews," into the meaning of whose words and manifestations he instituted no investigation; otherwise he would have seen, that it is not for oxen that God is concerned, even where He may appear to legislate for them, or for irrational animals, but that what is written for the sake of men, under the appearance of relating to irrational animals, contains certain truths of nature.[2] Celsus, moreover, says that no wrong is committed by any one who wishes to observe the religious worship sanctioned by the laws of his country; and it follows, according to his view, that the Scythians commit no wrong, when, in conformity with their

[1] γέλοιος ἂν εἴη φιλόσοφος ἀφιλόσοφα πράττων. [2] φυσιολογίαν.

country's laws, they eat human beings. And those Indians who eat their own fathers are considered, according to Celsus, to do a religious, or at least not a wicked act. He adduces, indeed, a statement of Herodotus which favours the principle that each one ought, from a sense of what is becoming, to obey his country's laws; and he appears to approve of the custom of those Indians called Callatians, who in the time of Darius devoured their parents, since, on Darius inquiring for how great a sum of money they would be willing to lay aside this usage, they raised a loud shout, and bade the king say no more.

Chapter xxxvii.

As there are, then, generally two laws presented to us, the one being the law of nature, of which God would be the legislator, and the other being the written law of cities, it is a proper thing, when the written law is not opposed to that of God, for the citizens not to abandon it under pretext of foreign customs; but when the law of nature, that is, the law of God, commands what is opposed to the written law, observe whether reason will not tell us to bid a long farewell to the written code, and to the desire of its legislators, and to give ourselves up to the legislator God, and to choose a life agreeable to His word, although in doing so it may be necessary to encounter dangers, and countless labours, and even death and dishonour. For when there are some laws in harmony with the will of God, which are opposed to others which are in force in cities, and when it is impracticable to please God (and those who administer laws of the kind referred to), it would be absurd to contemn those acts by means of which we may please the Creator of all things, and to select those by which we shall become displeasing to God, though we may satisfy unholy laws, and those who love them. But since it is reasonable in other matters to prefer the law of nature, which is the law of God, before the written law, which has been enacted by men in a spirit of opposition to the law of God, why should we not do this still more in the case of those laws which relate to God? Neither shall we, like the Ethiopians who inhabit the parts about Meroe, worship, as is their pleasure, Jupiter and Bacchus only; nor shall we at all reverence Ethiopian gods in the

Ethiopian manner; nor, like the Arabians, shall we regard Urania and Bacchus alone as divinities; nor in any degree at all deities in which the difference of sex has been a ground of distinction (as among the Arabians, who worship Urania as a female, and Bacchus as a male deity); nor shall we, like all the Egyptians, regard Osiris and Isis as gods; nor shall we enumerate Athena among these, as the Saïtes are pleased to do. And if to the ancient inhabitants of Naucratis it seemed good to worship other divinities, while their modern descendants have begun quite recently to pay reverence to Serapis, who never was a god at all, we shall not on that account assert that a new being who was not formerly a god, nor at all known to men, is a deity. For the Son of God, "the First-born of all creation," although He seemed recently to have become incarnate, is not by any means on that account recent. For the Holy Scriptures know Him to be the most ancient of all the works of creation;[1] for it was to Him that God said regarding the creation of man, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."[2]

Chapter xxxviii.

I wish, however, to show how Celsus asserts without any good reason, that each one reveres his domestic and native institutions. For he declares that "those Ethiopians who inhabit Meroe know only of two gods, Jupiter and Bacchus, and worship these alone; and that the Arabians also know only of two, viz. Bacchus, who is also an Ethiopian deity, and Urania, whose worship is confined to them." According to his account, neither do the Ethiopians worship Urania, nor the Arabians Jupiter. If, then, an Ethiopian were from any accident to fall into the hands of the Arabians, and were to be judged guilty of impiety because he did not worship Urania, and for this reason should incur the danger of death, would it be proper for the Ethiopian to die, or to act contrary to his country's laws, and do obeisance to Urania? Now, if it would be proper for him to act contrary to the laws of his country, he will do what is not right, so far as the language of Celsus is any standard; while, if he should be led away to death, let him show the reasonableness of selecting such a fate. I know not

[1] πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων. [2] Cf. Gen. i. 26.

whether, if the Ethiopian doctrine taught men to philosophize on the immortality of the soul, and the honour which is paid to religion, they would reverence those as deities who are deemed to be such by the laws of the country.[1] A similar illustration may be employed in the case of the Arabians, if from any accident they happened to visit the Ethiopians about Meroe. For, having been taught to worship Urania and Bacchus alone, they will not worship Jupiter along with the Ethiopians; and if, adjudged guilty of impiety, they should be led away to death, let Celsus tell us what it would be reasonable on their part to do. And with regard to the fables which relate to Osiris and Isis, it is superfluous and out of place at present to enumerate them. For although an allegorical meaning may be given to the fables, they will nevertheless teach us to offer divine worship to cold water, and to the earth, which is subject to men, and all the animal creation. For in this way, I presume, they refer Osiris to water, and Isis to earth; while with regard to Serapis the accounts are numerous and conflicting, to the effect that very recently he appeared in public, agreeably to certain juggling tricks performed at the desire of Ptolemy, who wished to show to the people of Alexandria as it were a visible god. And we have read in the writings of Numenius the Pythagorean regarding his formation, that he partakes of the essence of all the animals and plants that are under the control of nature, that he may appear to have been fashioned into a god, not by the makers of images alone, with the aid of profane mysteries, and juggling tricks employed to invoke demons, but also by magicians and sorcerers, and those demons who are bewitched by their incantations.[2]

Chapter xxxix.

We must therefore inquire what may be fittingly eaten or not by the rational and gentle[3] animal, which acts always in

[1] This sentence is regarded by Guietus as an interpolation, which should be struck out of the text.

[2] ἵνα δόξῃ μετὰ τῶν ἀτελέστων τελετῶν, καὶ τῶν καλουσῶν δαίμονας μαγγανειῶν, οὐχ ὑπὸ ἀγαλματοποιῶν μόνων κατασκευάζεσθαι θεὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ μάγων, καὶ Φαρμακῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐπῳδαῖς αὐτῶν κηλουμένων δαιμόνων.

[3] ἡμέρῳ.

conformity with reason; and not worship at random, sheep, or goats, or kine; to abstain from which is an act of moderation,[1] for much advantage is derived by men from these animals. Whereas, is it not the most foolish of all things to spare crocodiles, and to treat *them* as sacred to some fabulous divinity or other? For it is a mark of exceeding stupidity to spare those animals which do not spare us, and to bestow care on those which make a prey of human beings. But Celsus approves of those who, in keeping with the laws of their country, worship and tend crocodiles, and not a word does he say against them, while the Christians appear deserving of censure, who have been taught to loath evil, and to turn away from wicked works, and to reverence and honour virtue as being generated by God, and as being His Son. For we must not, on account of their feminine name and nature, regard wisdom and righteousness as females;[2] for these things are in our view the Son of God, as His genuine disciple has shown, when he said of Him, "Who of God is made to us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."[3] And although we may call Him a "second" God, let men know that by the term "second God" we mean nothing else than a virtue capable of including all other virtues, and a reason capable of containing all reason whatsoever which exists in all things, which have arisen naturally, directly, and for the general advantage, and which "reason," we say, dwelt in the soul of Jesus, and was united to Him in a degree far above all other souls, seeing He alone was enabled completely to receive the highest share in the absolute reason, and the absolute wisdom, and the absolute righteousness.

Chapter xl.

But since, after Celsus had spoken to the above effect of the different kinds of laws, he adds the following remark, "Pindar appears to me to be correct in saying that law is king of all things," let us proceed to discuss this assertion. What law do you mean to say, good sir, is "king of all things?" If you

[1] *μέτριον.*

[2] *οὐ γὰρ παρὰ τὸ θηλυκὸν ὄνομα, καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ θήλειαν νομιστέον εἶναι τὴν σοφίαν, καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην.*

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 30.

mean those which exist in the various cities, then such an assertion is not true. For all men are not governed by the same law. You ought to have said that "laws are kings of all men," for in every nation some law is king of all. But if you mean that which is law in the proper sense, then it is this which is by nature "king of all things;" although there are some individuals who, having like robbers abandoned the law, deny its validity, and live lives of violence and injustice. We Christians, then, who have come to the knowledge of the law which is by nature "king of all things," and which is the same with the law of God, endeavour to regulate our lives by its prescriptions, having bidden a long farewell to those of an unholy kind.

Chapter xli.

Let us notice the charges which are next advanced by Celsus, in which there is exceedingly little that has reference to the Christians, as most of them refer to the Jews. His words are: "If, then, in these respects the Jews were carefully to preserve their own law, they are not to be blamed for so doing, but those persons rather who have forsaken their own usages, and adopted those of the Jews. And if they pride themselves on it, as being possessed of superior wisdom, and keep aloof from intercourse with others, as not being equally pure with themselves, they have already heard that their doctrine concerning heaven is not peculiar to them, but, to pass by all others, is one which has long ago been received by the Persians, as Herodotus somewhere mentions. 'For they have a custom,' he says, 'of going up to the tops of the mountains, and of offering sacrifices to Jupiter, giving the name of Jupiter to the whole circle of the heavens.'[1] And I think," continues Celsus, "that it makes no difference whether you call the highest being Zeus, or Zen, or Adonai, or Sabaoth, or Ammoun like the Egyptians, or Pappæus like the Scythians. Nor would they be deemed at all holier than others in this respect, that they observe the rite of circumcision, for this was done by the Egyptians and Colchians before them; nor because they abstain from swine's flesh, for the Egyptians practised

[1] Cf. Herodot. i. 135.

abstinence not only from it, but from the flesh of goats, and sheep, and oxen, and fishes as well; while Pythagoras and his disciples do not eat beans, nor anything that contains life. It is not probable, however, that they enjoy God's favour, or are loved by Him differently from others, or that angels were sent from heaven to them alone, as if they had had allotted to them 'some region of the blessed,'[1] for we see both themselves and the country of which they were deemed worthy. Let this band,[2] then, take its departure, after paying the penalty of its vaunting, not having a knowledge of the great God, but being led away and deceived by the artifices of Moses, having become his pupil to no good end."

Chapter xlii.

It is evident that, by the preceding remarks, Celsus charges the Jews with falsely giving themselves out as the chosen portion of the Supreme God above all other nations. And he accuses them of boasting, because they gave out that they knew the great God, although they did not really know Him, but were led away by the artifices of Moses, and were deceived by him, and became his disciples to no good end. Now we have in the preceding pages already spoken in part of the venerable and distinguished polity of the Jews, when it existed amongst them as a symbol of the city of God, and of His temple, and of the sacrificial worship offered in it and at the altar of sacrifice. But if any one were to turn his attention to the meaning of the legislator, and to the constitution which he established, and were to examine the various points relating to him, and compare them with the present method of worship among other nations, there are none which he would admire to a greater degree; because, so far as can be accomplished among mortals, everything that was not of advantage to the human race was withheld from them, and only those things which are useful bestowed. And for this reason they had neither gymnastic contests, nor scenic representations, nor horse-races; nor were there among them women who sold their beauty to any one who wished to have sexual intercourse without offspring, and to cast contempt upon the nature of human

[1] οἷον δή τινα μακάρων χώραν λαχοῦσιν. [2] χορός.

generation. And what an advantage was it to be taught from their tender years to ascend above all visible nature, and to hold the belief that God was not fixed anywhere within its limits, but to look for Him on high, and beyond the sphere of all bodily substance![1] And how great was the advantage which they enjoyed in being instructed almost from their birth, and as soon as they could speak,[2] in the immortality of the soul, and in the existence of courts of justice under the earth, and in the rewards provided for those who have lived righteous lives! These truths, indeed, were proclaimed in the veil of fable to children, and to those whose views of things were childish; while to those who were already occupied in investigating the truth, and desirous of making progress therein, these fables, so to speak, were transfigured into the truths which were concealed within them. And I consider that it was in a manner worthy of their name as the "portion of God" that they despised all kinds of divination, as that which bewitches men to no purpose, and which proceeds rather from wicked demons than from anything of a better nature; and sought the knowledge of future events in the souls of those who, owing to their high degree of purity, received the spirit of the Supreme God.

Chapter xliii.

But what need is there to point out how agreeable to sound reason, and unattended with injury either to master or slave, was the law that one of the same faith[3] should not be allowed to continue in slavery more than six years?[4] The Jews, then, cannot be said to preserve their own law in the same points with the other nations. For it would be censurable in them, and would involve a charge of insensibility to the superiority of their law, if they were to believe that they had been legislated for in the same way as the other nations among the heathen. And although Celsus will not admit it, the Jews nevertheless *are* possessed of a wisdom superior not only to that of the multitude, but also of those who have the appearance of philosophers;

[1] ὑπὲρ τὰ σώματα. [2] συμπληρώσει τοῦ λόγου.
[3] τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ὁρώμενον δογμάτων.
[4] Cf. Ex. xxi. 2 and Jer. xxxiv. 14.

because those who engage in philosophical pursuits, after the utterance of the most venerable philosophical sentiments, fall away into the worship of idols and demons, whereas the very lowest Jew directs his look to the Supreme God alone; and they do well, indeed, so far as this point is concerned, to pride themselves thereon, and to keep aloof from the society of others as accursed and impious. And would that they had not sinned, and transgressed the law, and slain the prophets in former times, and in these latter days conspired against Jesus, that we might be in possession of a pattern of a heavenly city which even Plato would have sought to describe; although I doubt whether he could have accomplished as much as was done by Moses and those who followed him, who nourished a "chosen generation," and "a holy nation," dedicated to God, with words free from all superstition.

Chapter xliv.

But as Celsus would compare the venerable customs of the Jews with the laws of certain nations, let us proceed to look at them. He is of opinion, accordingly, that there is no difference between the doctrine regarding "heaven" and that regarding "God;" and he says that "the Persians, like the Jews, offer sacrifices to Jupiter upon the tops of the mountains,"—not observing that, as the Jews were acquainted with one God, so they had only one holy house of prayer, and one altar of whole burnt-offerings, and one censer for incense, and one high priest of God. The Jews, then, had nothing in common with the Persians, who ascend the summits of their mountains, which are many in number, and offer up sacrifices which have nothing in common with those which are regulated by the Mosaic code, —in conformity to which the Jewish priests "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," explaining enigmatically the object of the law regarding the sacrifices, and the things of which these sacrifices were the symbols. The Persians therefore may call the "whole circle of heaven" Jupiter; but we maintain that "the heaven" is neither Jupiter nor God, as we indeed know that certain beings of a class inferior to God have ascended above the heavens and all visible nature: and in this sense we understand the words, "Praise God, ye

heaven of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens; let them praise the name of the Lord."[1]

Chapter xlv.

As Celsus, however, is of opinion that it matters nothing whether the highest being be called Jupiter, or Zen, or Adonai, or Sabaoth, or Ammoun (as the Egyptians term him), or Pappæus (as the Scythians entitle him), let us discuss the point for a little, reminding the reader at the same time of what has been said above upon this question, when the language of Celsus led us to consider the subject. And now we maintain that the nature of names is not, as Aristotle supposes, an enactment of those who impose them.[2] For the languages which are prevalent among men do not derive their origin from men, as is evident to those who are able to ascertain the nature of the charms which are appropriated by the inventors of the languages differently, according to the various tongues, and to the varying pronunciations of the names, on which we have spoken briefly in the preceding pages, remarking that when those names which in a certain language were possessed of a natural power were translated into another, they were no longer able to accomplish what they did before when uttered in their native tongues. And the same peculiarity is found to apply to men; for if we were to translate the name of one who was called from his birth by a certain appellation in the Greek language into the Egyptian or Roman, or any other tongue, we could not make him do or suffer the same things which he would have done or suffered under the appellation first bestowed upon him. Nay, even if we translated into the Greek language the name of an individual who had been originally invoked in the Roman tongue, we could not produce the result which the incantation professed itself capable of accomplishing had it preserved the name first conferred upon him. And if these statements are true when spoken of the names of *men*, what are we to think of those which are transferred, for any cause whatever, to the *Deity?* For example, something is transferred[3] from the

[1] Cf. Ps. cxlviii. 4, 5.

[2] ὅτι ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων φύσις οὐ θεμένων εἰσὶ νόμοι.

[3] μεταλαμβάνεται γάρ τι, φερ᾽ εἰπεῖν. In the editions of Hœschel and Spencer, τι is wanting.

name Abraham when translated into Greek, and something is signified by that of Isaac, and also by that of Jacob; and accordingly, if any one, either in an invocation or in swearing an oath, were to use the expression, "the God of Abraham," and "the God of Isaac," and "the God of Jacob," he would produce certain effects, either owing to the nature of these names or to their powers, since even demons are vanquished and become submissive to him who pronounces these names; whereas if we say, "the god of the chosen father of the echo, and the god of laughter, and the god of him who strikes with the heel,"[1] the mention of the name is attended with no result, as is the case with other names possessed of no power. And in the same way, if we translate the word "Israel" into Greek or any other language, we shall produce no result; but if we retain it as it is, and join it to those expressions to which such as are skilled in these matters think it ought to be united, there would then follow some result from the pronunciation of the word which would accord with the professions of those who employ such invocations. And we may say the same also of the pronunciation of "Sabaoth," a word which is frequently employed in incantations; for if we translate the term into "Lord of hosts," or "Lord of armies," or "Almighty" (different acceptations of it having been proposed by the interpreters), we shall accomplish nothing; whereas if we retain the original pronunciation, we shall, as those who are skilled in such matters maintain, produce some effect. And the same observation holds good of Adonai. If, then, neither "Sabaoth" nor "Adonai," when rendered into what appears to be their meaning in the Greek tongue, can accomplish anything, how much less would be the result among those who regard it as a matter of indifference whether the highest being be called Jupiter, or Zen, or Adonai, or Sabaoth!

Chapter xlvi.

It was for these and similar mysterious reasons, with which Moses and the prophets were acquainted, that they forbade the name of other gods to be pronounced by him who bethought

[1] ὁ θεὸς πατρὸς ἐκλεκτοῦ τῆς ἠχοῦς, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ γέλωτος, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πτερνιστοῦ. Cf. note in Benedictine ed.

himself of praying to the one Supreme God alone, or to be remembered by a heart which had been taught to be pure from all foolish thoughts and words. And for these reasons we should prefer to endure all manner of suffering rather than acknowledge Jupiter to be God. For we do not consider Jupiter and Sabaoth to be the same, nor Jupiter to be at all divine, but that some demon, unfriendly to men and to the true God, rejoices under this title.[1] And although the Egyptians were to hold Ammon before us under threat of death, we would rather die than address him as God, it being a name used in all probability in certain Egyptian incantations in which this demon is invoked. And although the Scythians may call Pappæus the supreme God, yet we will not yield our assent to this; granting, indeed, that there *is* a Supreme Deity, although we do not give the name Pappæus to Him as His proper title, but regard it as one which is agreeable to the demon to whom was allotted the desert of Scythia, with its people and its language. He, however, who gives God His title in the Scythian tongue, or in the Egyptian or in any language in which he has been brought up, will not be guilty of sin.

Chapter xlvii.

Now the reason why circumcision is practised among the Jews is not the same as that which explains its existence among the Egyptians and Colchians, and therefore it is not to be considered the same circumcision. And as he who sacrifices does not sacrifice to the same god, although he appears to perform the rite of sacrifice in a similar manner, and he who offers up prayer does not pray to the same divinity, although he asks the same things in his supplication; so, in the same way, if one performs the rite of circumcision, it by no means follows that it is not a different act from the circumcision performed upon another. For the purpose, and the law, and the wish of him who performs the rite, place the act in a different category. But that the whole subject may be still better understood, we have to remark that the term for "righteousness"[2] is the same among all the Greeks; but righteousness is shown to be one thing according to the view of Epicurus; and another accord-

[1] δαίμονα δέ τινα χαίρειν οὕτως ὀνομαζόμενον. [2] δικαιοσύνη.

ing to the Stoics, who deny the threefold division of the soul; and a different thing again according to the followers of Plato, who hold that righteousness is the proper business of the parts of the soul.[1] And so also the "courage"[2] of Epicurus is one thing, who would undergo some labours in order to escape from a greater number; and a different thing that of the philosopher of the Porch, who would choose all virtue for its own sake; and a different thing still that of Plato, who maintains that virtue itself is the act of the irascible part of the soul, and who assigns to it a place about the breast.[3] And so circumcision will be a different thing according to the varying opinions of those who undergo it. But on such a subject it is unnecessary to speak on this occasion in a treatise like the present; for whoever desires to see what led us to the subject, can read what we have said upon it in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

Chapter xlviii.

Although the Jews, then, pride themselves on circumcision, they will separate it not only from that of the Colchians and Egyptians, but also from that of the Arabian Ishmaelites; and yet the latter was derived from their ancestor Abraham, the father of Ishmael, who underwent the rite of circumcision along with his father. The Jews say that the circumcision performed on the eighth day is the principal circumcision, and that which is performed according to circumstances is different; and probably it was performed on account of the hostility of some angel towards the Jewish nation, who had the power to injure such of them as were not circumcised, but was powerless against those who had undergone the rite. This may be said to appear from what is written in the book of Exodus, where the angel before the circumcision of Eliezer[4] was able to work against[5] Moses, but could do nothing after his son was circumcised. And when Zipporah had learned this, she took a pebble and circumcised her child, and is recorded, according to the

[1] ἰδιοπραγίαν τῶν μερῶν τῆς ψυχῆς. [2] ἀνδρεία.

[3] τοῦ θυμικοῦ μέρους τῆς ψυχῆς φάσκοντος αὐτὸ εἶναι ἀρετήν, καὶ ἀποτάσσοντος αὐτῇ τόπον τὸν περὶ τὸν θωράκα.

[4] Cf. Ex. iv. 24, 25. Eliezer was one of the two sons of Moses. Cf. Ex. xviii. 4. [5] ἐνεργεῖν κατὰ Μωϋσέως.

reading of the common copies, to have said, "The blood of my child's circumcision is stayed," but according to the Hebrew text, "A bloody husband art thou to me."[1] For she had known the story about a certain angel having power before the shedding of the blood, but who became powerless through the blood of circumcision. For which reason the words were addressed to Moses, "A bloody husband art thou to me." But these things, which appear rather of a curious nature, and not level to the comprehension of the multitude, I have ventured to treat at such length; and now I shall only add, as becomes a Christian, one thing more, and shall then pass on to what follows. For this angel might have had power, I think, over those of the people who were not circumcised, and generally over all who worshipped only the Creator; and this power lasted so long as Jesus had not assumed a human body. But when He had done this, and had undergone the rite of circumcision in His own person, all the power of the angel over those who practise the same worship, but are not circumcised,[2] was abolished; for Jesus reduced it to nought by [the power of] His unspeakable divinity. And therefore His disciples are forbidden to circumcise themselves, and are reminded [by the apostle]: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing."[3]

Chapter xlix.

But neither do the Jews pride themselves upon abstaining from swine's flesh, as if it were some great thing; but upon their having ascertained the nature of clean and unclean animals, and the cause of the distinction, and of swine being classed among the unclean. And these distinctions were signs of certain things until the advent of Jesus; after whose coming it was said to His disciple, who did not yet comprehend the doctrine concerning these matters, but who said, "Nothing that is common or unclean hath entered into my mouth,"[4] "What God hath cleansed, call not thou common." It therefore in no way affects either the Jews or us that the Egyptian priests

[1] Cf. Ex. iv. 25, 26.

[2] κατὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ θεοσεβείᾳ ταύτῃ περιτεμνομένων δύναμις. Boherellus inserts μὴ before περιτεμνομένων, which has been adopted in the text.

[3] Gal. v. 2.

[4] Cf. Acts x. 14.

abstain not only from the flesh of swine, but also from that of goats, and sheep, and oxen, and fish. But since it is not that "which entereth into the mouth that defiles a man," and since "meat does not commend us to God," we do not set great store on refraining from eating, nor yet are we induced to eat from a gluttonous appetite. And therefore, so far as we are concerned, the followers of Pythagoras, who abstain from all things that contain life, may do as they please; only observe the different reason for abstaining from things that have life on the part of the Pythagoreans and our ascetics. For the former abstain on account of the fable about the transmigration of souls, as the poet says:

> "And some one, lifting up his beloved son,
> Will slay him after prayer; O how foolish he!"[1]

We, however, when we do abstain, do so because "we keep under our body, and bring it into subjection,"[2] and desire "to mortify our members that are upon the earth, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence;"[3] and we use every effort to "mortify the deeds of the flesh."[4]

Chapter L.

Celsus, still expressing his opinion regarding the Jews, says: "It is not probable that they are in great favour with God, or are regarded by Him with more affection than others, or that angels are sent by Him to them alone, as if to them had been allotted some region of the blessed. For we may see both the people themselves, and the country of which they were deemed worthy." We shall refute this, by remarking that it is evident that this nation *was* in great favour with God, from the fact that the God who presides over all things was called the God of the Hebrews, even by those who were aliens to our faith. And because they were in favour with God, they were not abandoned by Him;[5] but although few in number, they continued to enjoy

[1] καί τις φίλον υἱὸν ἀείρας,
σφάξει ἐπευχόμενος μέγα νήπιος.
—A verse of Empedocles, quoted by Plutarch, *de Superstitione*, c. xii. Spencer. Cf. note *in loc.* in Benedictine edition.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27. [3] Cf. Col. iii. 5. [4] Cf. Rom. viii. 13.

[5] καὶ ὡς εὐδοκιμοῦντες γε ὅσον οὐκ ἐγκατελείποντο. The negative particle (οὐκ) is wanting in the editions of Hœschel and Spencer, but is found in

the protection of the divine power, so that in the reign of Alexander of Macedon they sustained no injury from him, although they refused, on account of certain covenants and oaths, to take up arms against Darius. They say that on that occasion the Jewish high priest, clothed in his sacred robe, received obeisance from Alexander, who declared that he had beheld an individual arrayed in this fashion, who announced to him in his sleep that he was to be the subjugator of the whole of Asia. Accordingly, we Christians maintain that "it was the fortune of that people in a remarkable degree to enjoy God's favour, and to be loved by Him in a way different from others;" but that this economy of things and this divine favour were transferred to us, after Jesus had conveyed the power which had been manifested among the Jews to those who had become converts to Him from among the heathen. And for this reason, although the Romans desired to perpetrate many atrocities against the Christians, in order to ensure their extermination, they were unsuccessful; for there was a divine hand which fought on their behalf, and whose desire it was that the word of God should spread from one corner of the land of Judea throughout the whole human race.

Chapter li.

But seeing that we have answered to the best of our ability the charges brought by Celsus against the Jews and their doctrine, let us proceed to consider what follows, and to prove that it is no empty boast on our part when we make a profession of knowing the great God, and that we have not been led away by any juggling tricks[1] of Moses (as Celsus imagines), or even of our own Saviour Jesus; but that for a good end we listen to the God who speaks in Moses, and have accepted Jesus, whom he testifies to be God, as the Son of God, in hope of receiving the best rewards if we regulate our lives according to His word. And we shall willingly pass over what we have already stated by way of anticipation on the points, "whence

the Royal, Basil, and Vatican MSS. Guietus would delete ὅσον (which emendation has been adopted in the translation), while Boherellus would read ὅσοι instead.—Ruæus.

[1] γοητείᾳ.

we came, and who is our leader, and what law proceeded from Him." And if Celsus would maintain that there is no difference between us and the Egyptians, who worship the goat, or the ram, or the crocodile, or the ox, or the river-horse, or the dog-faced baboon,[1] or the cat, he can ascertain if it be so, and so may any other who thinks alike on the subject. We, however, have to the best of our ability defended ourselves at great length in the preceding pages on the subject of the honour which we render to our Jesus, pointing out that we have found the better part;[2] and that in showing that the truth which is contained in the teaching of Jesus Christ is pure and unmixed with error, we are not commending ourselves, but our Teacher, to whom testimony was borne through many witnesses by the Supreme God and the prophetic writings among the Jews, and by the very clearness of the case itself, for it is demonstrated that He could not have accomplished such mighty works without the divine help.

Chapter lii.

But the statement of Celsus which we wish to examine at present is the following: "Let us then pass over the refutations which might be adduced against the claims of their teacher, and let him be regarded as really an angel. But is he the first and only one who came [to men], or were there others before him? If they should say that he is the only one, they would be convicted of telling lies against themselves. For they assert that on many occasions others came, and sixty or seventy of them together, and that these became wicked, and were cast under the earth and punished with chains, and that from this source originate the warm springs, which are their tears; and, moreover, that there came an angel to the tomb of this said being—according to some, indeed, one, but according to others, two—who answered the women that he had arisen. For the Son of God could not himself, as it seems, open the tomb, but needed the help of another to roll away the stone. And again, on account of the pregnancy of Mary, there came an angel to the carpenter, and once more another angel, in order that they might take up the young child and

[1] τὸν κυνοκέφαλον. [2] ὅτι κρεῖττον εὕρομεν.

flee away [into Egypt]. But what need is there to particularize everything, or to count up the number of angels said to have been sent to Moses, and others amongst them? If, then, others were sent, it is manifest that he also came from the same God. But he may be supposed to have the appearance of announcing something of greater importance [than those who preceded him], as if the Jews had been committing sin, or corrupting their religion, or doing deeds of impiety; for these things are obscurely hinted at."

Chapter liii.

The preceding remarks might suffice as an answer to the charges of Celsus, so far as regards those points in which our Saviour Jesus Christ is made the subject of special investigation. But that we may avoid the appearance of intentionally passing over any portion of his work, as if we were unable to meet him, let us, even at the risk of being tautological (since we are challenged to this by Celsus), endeavour as far as we can with all due brevity to continue our discourse, since perhaps something either more precise or more novel may occur to us upon the several topics. He says, indeed, that "he has omitted the refutations which have been adduced against the claims which Christians advance on behalf of their teacher," although he has *not* omitted anything which he was able to bring forward, as is manifest from his previous language, but makes this statement only as an empty rhetorical device. That we are not refuted, however, on the subject of our great Saviour, although the accuser may *appear* to refute us, will be manifest to those who peruse in a spirit of truth-loving investigation all that is predicted and recorded of Him. And, in the next place, since he considers that he makes a concession in saying of the Saviour, "Let him appear to be really an angel," we reply that we do not accept of such a concession from Celsus; but we look to the work of Him who came to visit the whole human race in His word and teaching, as each one of His adherents was capable of receiving Him. And this was the work of one who, as the prophecy regarding Him said, was not simply an angel, but the "Angel of the great council:"[1] for He announced

[1] Cf. Isa. ix. 6.

to men the great counsel of the God and Father of all things regarding them, [saying] of those who yield themselves up to a life of pure religion, that they ascend by means of their great deeds to God; but of those who do not adhere to Him, that they place themselves at a distance from God, and journey on to destruction through their unbelief of Him. He then continues: "If even the angel came to men, is he the first and only one who came, or did others come on former occasions?" And he thinks he can meet either of these dilemmas at great length, although there is not a single real Christian who asserts that Christ was the only being that visited the human race. For, as Celsus says, "If they should say the only one," there are others who appeared to different individuals.

Chapter liv.

In the next place, he proceeds to answer himself as he thinks fit in the following terms: "And so he is not the only one who is recorded to have visited the human race, as even those who, under pretext of teaching in the name of Jesus, have apostatized from the Creator as an inferior being, and have given in their adherence to one who is a superior God and father of him who visited [the world], assert that before him certain beings came from the Creator to visit the human race." Now, as it is in the spirit of truth that we investigate all that relates to the subject, we shall remark that it is asserted by Apelles, the celebrated disciple of Marcion, who became the founder of a certain sect, and who treated the writings of the Jews as fabulous, that Jesus is the only one that came to visit the human race. Even against him, then, who maintained that Jesus was the only one that came from God to men, it would be in vain for Celsus to quote the statements regarding the descent of other angels, seeing Apelles discredits, as we have already mentioned, the miraculous narratives of the Jewish Scriptures; and much more will he decline to admit what Celsus has adduced, from not understanding the contents of the book of Enoch. No one, then, convicts us of falsehood, or of making contradictory assertions, as if we maintained both that our Saviour was the only being that ever came to men, and yet that many others came on different occasions. And in a

most confused manner, moreover, does he adduce, when examining the subject of the visits of angels to men, what he has derived, without seeing its meaning, from the contents of the book of Enoch; for he does not appear to have read the passages in question, nor to have been aware that the books which bear the name of Enoch do not at all circulate in the churches as divine, although it is from this source that he might be supposed to have obtained the statement, that "sixty or seventy angels descended at the same time, who fell into a state of wickedness."

Chapter lv.

But, that we may grant to him in a spirit of candour what he has not discovered in the contents of the book of Genesis, that "the sons of God, seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair, took to them wives of all whom they chose," we shall nevertheless even on this point persuade those who are capable of understanding the meaning of the prophet, that even before us there was one who referred this narrative to the doctrine regarding souls, which became possessed with a desire for the corporeal life of men, and this in metaphorical language, he said, was termed "daughters of men." But whatever may be the meaning of the "sons of God desiring to possess the daughters of men," it will not at all contribute to prove that Jesus was not the only one who visited mankind as an angel, and who manifestly became the Saviour and benefactor of all those who depart from the flood of wickedness. Then, mixing up and confusing whatever he had at any time heard, or had anywhere found written—whether held to be of divine origin among Christians or not—he adds: "The sixty or seventy who descended together were cast under the earth, and were punished with chains." And he quotes (as from the book of Enoch, but without naming it) the following: "And hence it is that the tears of these angels are warm springs,"—a thing neither mentioned nor heard of in the churches of God! For no one was ever so foolish as to materialize into human tears those which were shed by the angels who had come down from heaven. And if it were right to pass a jest upon what is advanced against us in a serious spirit by Celsus, we might

observe that no one would ever have said that hot springs, the greater part of which are fresh water, were the tears of the angels, since tears are saltish in their nature, unless indeed the angels, in the opinion of Celsus, shed tears which are fresh.

Chapter lvi.

Proceeding immediately after to mix up and compare with one another things that are dissimilar, and incapable of being united, he subjoins to his statement regarding the sixty or seventy angels who came down from heaven, and who, according to him, shed fountains of warm water for tears, the following: "It is related also that there came to the tomb of Jesus himself, according to some, two angels, according to others, one;" having failed to notice, I think, that Matthew and Mark speak of one, and Luke and John of two, which statements are not contradictory. For they who mention "one," say that it was he who rolled away the stone from the sepulchre; while they who mention "two," refer to those who appeared in shining raiment to the women that repaired to the sepulchre, or who were seen within sitting in white garments. Each of these occurrences might now be demonstrated to have actually taken place, and to be indicative of a figurative meaning existing in these "phenomena," [and intelligible] to those who were prepared to behold the resurrection of the Word. Such a task, however, does not belong to our present purpose, but rather to an exposition of the gospel.

Chapter lvii.

Now, that miraculous appearances have sometimes been witnessed by human beings, is related by the Greeks; and not only by those of them who might be suspected of composing fabulous narratives, but also by those who have given every evidence of being genuine philosophers, and of having related with perfect truth what had happened to them. Accounts of this kind we have read in the writings of Chrysippus of Soli, and also some things of the same kind relating to Pythagoras; as well as in some of the more recent writers who lived a very short time ago, as in the treatise of Plutarch of Chæronea "on the Soul," and in the second book of the work of Numenius

the Pythagorean on the "Incorruptibility of the Soul." Now, when such accounts are related by the Greeks, and especially by the philosophers among them, they are not to be received with mockery and ridicule, nor to be regarded as fictions and fables; but when those who are devoted to the God of all things, and who endure all kinds of injury, even to death itself, rather than allow a falsehood to escape their lips regarding God, announce the appearances of angels which they have themselves witnessed, they are to be deemed unworthy of belief, and their words are not to be regarded as true! Now it is opposed to sound reason to judge in this way whether individuals are speaking truth or falsehood. For those who act honestly, only after a long and careful examination into the details of a subject, slowly and cautiously express their opinion of the veracity or falsehood of this or that person with regard to the marvels which they may relate; since it is the case that neither do all men show themselves worthy of belief, nor do all make it distinctly evident that they are relating to men only fictions and fables. Moreover, regarding the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, we have this remark to make, that it is not at all wonderful if, on such an occasion, either one or two angels should have appeared to announce that Jesus had risen from the dead, and to provide for the safety of those who believed in such an event to the advantage of their souls. Nor does it appear to me at all unreasonable, that those who believe in the resurrection of Jesus, and who manifest, as a fruit of their faith not to be lightly esteemed, their possession of a virtuous[1] life, and their withdrawal from the flood of evils, should not be unattended by angels who lend their help in accomplishing their conversion to God.

Chapter lviii.

But Celsus challenges the account also that an angel rolled away the stone from the sepulchre where the body of Jesus lay, acting like a lad at school, who should bring a charge against any one by help of a string of commonplaces. And, as if he had discovered some clever objection to the narrative, he remarks: "The Son of God, then, it appears, could not open his

[1] τὸν ἐῤῥωμένον βίον.

tomb, but required the aid of another to roll away the stone." Now, not to overdo the discussion of this matter, or to have the appearance of unreasonably introducing philosophical remarks, by explaining the figurative meaning at present, I shall simply say of the narrative alone, that it does appear in itself a more respectful proceeding, that the servant and inferior should have rolled away the stone, than that such an act should have been performed by Him whose resurrection was to be for the advantage of mankind. I do not speak of the desire of those who conspired against the Word, and who wished to put Him to death, and to show to all men that He *was* dead and non-existent,[1] that His tomb should not be opened, in order that no one might behold the Word alive after their conspiracy; but the "Angel of God" who came into the world for the salvation of men, with the help of another angel, proved more powerful than the conspirators, and rolled away the weighty stone, that those who deemed the Word to be dead might be convinced that He is not with the "departed," but is alive, and precedes those who are willing to follow Him, that He may manifest to them those truths which come after those which He formerly showed them at the time of their first entrance [into the school of Christianity], when they were as yet incapable of receiving deeper instruction. In the next place, I do not understand what advantage he thinks will accrue to his purpose when he ridicules the account of "the angel's visit to Joseph regarding the pregnancy of Mary;" and again, that of the angel to warn the parents "to take up the new-born child, whose life was in danger, and to flee with it into Egypt." Concerning these matters, however, we have in the preceding pages answered his statements. But what does Celsus mean by saying, that "according to the Scriptures, angels are recorded to have been sent to Moses, and others as well?" For it appears to me to contribute nothing to his purpose, and especially because none of them made any effort to accomplish, as far as in his power, the conversion of the human race from their sins. Let it be granted, however, that other angels were sent from God, but that he came to announce something of greater importance [than any others who preceded him]; and when the Jews had

[1] καὶ τὸ μηδὲν τυγχάνοντα.

fallen into sin, and corrupted their religion, and had done unholy deeds, transferred the kingdom of God to other husbandmen, who in all the churches take special care of themselves,[1] and use every endeavour by means of a holy life, and by a doctrine conformable thereto, to win over to the God of all things those who would rush away from the teaching of Jesus.[2]

Chapter lix.

Celsus then continues: "The Jews accordingly, and these (clearly meaning the Christians), have the same God;" and as if advancing a proposition which would not be conceded, he proceeds to make the following assertion: "It is certain, indeed, that the members of the great church[3] admit this, and adopt as true the accounts regarding the creation of the world which are current among the Jews, viz. concerning the six days and the seventh;" on which day, as the Scripture says, God "ceased"[4] from His works, retiring into the contemplation of Himself, but on which, as Celsus says (who does not abide by the letter of the history, and who does not understand its meaning), God "rested,"[5]—a term which is not found in the record. With respect, however, to the creation of the world, and the "rest[6] which is reserved after it for the people of God," the subject is extensive, and mystical, and profound, and difficult of explanation. In the next place, as it appears to me, from a desire to fill up his book, and to give it an appearance of importance, he recklessly adds certain statements, such as the following, relating to the first man, of whom he says: "We give the same account as do the Jews, and deduce the same genealogy from him as they do." However, as regards "the conspiracies of brothers against one another," we know of none such, save that Cain conspired against Abel, and Esau against Jacob; but not Abel against Cain, nor Jacob against Esau: for if this had been the case, Celsus would have been correct

[1] ἑαυτῶν. Guietus would read αὐτῶν, to agree with τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

[2] Instead of τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀφορμάς, Boherellus conjectures τοὺς . . . ἀφορμῶντας, which has been adopted in the translation.

[3] τῶν ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας.

[4] κατέπαυσεν.

[5] ἀναπαυσάμενος.

[6] σαββατισμοῦ.

in saying that we give the same accounts as do the Jews of "the conspiracies of brothers against one another." Let it be granted, however, that we speak of the same descent into Egypt as they, and of their return[1] thence, which was not a "flight,"[2] as Celsus considers it to have been, what does that avail towards founding an accusation against us or against the Jews? Here, indeed, he thought to cast ridicule upon us, when, in speaking of the Hebrew people, he termed their exodus a "flight;" but when it was his business to investigate the account of the punishments inflicted by God upon Egypt, that topic he purposely passed by in silence.

Chapter lx.

If, however, it be necessary to express ourselves with precision in our answer to Celsus, who thinks that we hold the same opinions on the matters in question as do the Jews, we would say that we both agree that the books [of Scripture] were written by the Spirit of God, but that we do *not* agree about the meaning of their contents; for we do not regulate our lives like the Jews, because we are of opinion that the literal acceptation of the laws is not that which conveys the meaning of the legislation. And we maintain, that "when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart,"[3] because the meaning of the law of Moses has been concealed from those who have not welcomed[4] the way which is by Jesus Christ. But we know that if one turn to the Lord (for "the Lord is that Spirit"), the veil being taken away, "he beholds, as in a mirror with unveiled face, the glory of the Lord" in those thoughts which are concealed in their literal expression, and to his own glory becomes a participator of the divine glory; the term "face" being used figuratively for the "understanding," as one would call it without a figure, in which is the face of the "inner man," filled with light and glory, flowing from the true comprehension of the contents of the law.

Chapter lxi.

After the above remarks he proceeds as follows: "Let no

[1] τὴν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπάνοδον.
[2] φυγήν.
[3] 2 Cor. iii. 15.
[4] ἀσπασαμένοις.

one suppose that I am ignorant that some of them will concede that their God is the same as that of the Jews, while others will maintain that he is a different one, to whom the latter is in opposition, and that it was from the former that the Son came." Now, if he imagine that the existence of numerous heresies among the Christians is a ground of accusation against Christianity, why, in a similar way, should it not be a ground of accusation against philosophy, that the various sects of philosophers differ from each other, not on small and indifferent points, but upon those of the highest importance? Nay, medicine also ought to be a subject of attack, on account of its many conflicting schools. Let it be admitted, then, that there are amongst us some who deny that our God is the same as that of the Jews: nevertheless, on that account those are not to be blamed who prove from the same Scriptures that one and the same Deity is the God of the Jews and of the Gentiles alike, as Paul, too, distinctly says, who was a convert from Judaism to Christianity, "I thank my God, whom I serve from my forefathers with a pure conscience."[1] And let it be admitted also, that there is a third class who call certain persons "carnal," and others "spiritual" (I think he here means the followers of Valentinus): yet what does this avail against us, who belong to the church, and who make it an accusation against such as hold that certain natures are saved, and that others perish in consequence of their natural constitution?[2] And let it be admitted further, that there are some who give themselves out as Gnostics, in the same way as those Epicureans who call themselves philosophers: yet neither will they who annihilate the doctrine of providence be deemed true philosophers, nor those true Christians who introduce monstrous inventions, which are disapproved of by those who are the disciples of Jesus. Let it be admitted, moreover, that there are some who accept Jesus, and who boast on that account of being Christians, and yet would regulate their lives, like the Jewish multitude, in accordance with the Jewish law,—and these are the twofold sect of Ebionites, who either acknowledge with us that Jesus was born of a virgin, or deny this, and maintain that He was begotten like other human beings,—what does

[1] 2 Tim. i. 3. [2] ἐκ κατασκευῆς.

that avail by way of charge against such as belong to the church, and whom Celsus has styled "those of the multitude?"[1] He adds, also, that certain of the Christians are believers in the Sibyl,[2] having probably misunderstood some who blamed such as believed in the existence of a prophetic Sibyl, and termed those who held this belief Sibyllists.

Chapter lxii.

He next pours down upon us a heap of names, saying that he knows of the existence of certain Simonians who worship Helene, or Helenus, as their teacher, and are called Helenians. But it has escaped the notice of Celsus that the Simonians do not at all acknowledge Jesus to be the Son of God, but term Simon the "power" of God, regarding whom they relate certain marvellous stories, saying that he imagined that if he could become possessed of similar powers to those with which he believed Jesus to be endowed, he too would become as powerful among men as Jesus was amongst the multitude. But neither Celsus nor Simon could comprehend how Jesus, like a good husbandman of the word of God, was able to sow the greater part of Greece, and of barbarian lands, with His doctrine, and to fill these countries with words which transform the soul from all that is evil, and bring it back to the Creator of all things. Celsus knows, moreover, certain Marcellians, so called from Marcellina, and Harpocratians from Salome, and others who derive their name from Mariamne, and others again from Martha. We, however, who from a love of learning examine to the utmost of our ability not only the contents of Scripture, and the differences to which they give rise, but have also, from love to the truth, investigated as far as we could the opinions of philosophers, have never at any time met in with these sects. He makes mention also of the Marcionites, whose leader was Marcion.

Chapter lxiii.

In the next place, that he may have the appearance of knowing still more than he has yet mentioned, he says, agreeably to his usual custom, that "there are others who have

[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους. [2] Σιβυλλιστάς.

wickedly invented some being as their teacher and demon, and who wallow about in a great darkness, more unholy and accursed than that of the companions of the Egyptian Antinous." And he seems to me, indeed, in touching on these matters, to say with a certain degree of truth, that there are certain others who have wickedly invented another demon, and who have found him to be their lord, as they wallow about in the great darkness of their ignorance. With respect, however, to Antinous, who is compared with our Jesus, we shall not repeat what we have already said in the preceding pages. "Moreover," he continues, "these persons utter against one another dreadful blasphemies, saying all manner of things shameful to be spoken; nor will they yield in the slightest point for the sake of harmony, hating each other with a perfect hatred." Now, in answer to this, we have already said that in philosophy and medicine sects are to be found warring against sects. We, however, who are followers of the word of Jesus, and have exercised ourselves in thinking, and saying, and doing what is in harmony with His words, "when reviled, bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat;"[1] and we would *not* utter "all manner of things shameful to be spoken" against those who have adopted different opinions from ours, but, if possible, use every exertion to raise them to a better condition through adherence to the Creator alone, and lead them to perform every act as those who will [one day] be judged. And if those who hold different opinions will not be convinced, we observe the injunction laid down for the treatment of such: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."[2] Moreover, we who know the maxim, "Blessed are the peacemakers," and this also, "Blessed are the meek," would not regard with hatred the corrupters of Christianity, nor term those who had fallen into error Circes and flattering deceivers.[3]

Chapter lxiv.

Celsus appears to me to have misunderstood the statement of

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13.

[2] Tit. iii. 10.

[3] Κίρκας καὶ κύκηθρα αἱμύλα.

the apostle, which declares that "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe;"[1] and to have misunderstood also those who employed these declarations of the apostle against such as had corrupted the doctrines of Christianity. And it is owing to this cause that Celsus has said that "certain among the Christians are called 'cauterized in the ears;'"[2] and also that some are termed "enigmas,"[3]—a term which we have never met. The expression "stumbling-block"[4] is, indeed, of frequent occurrence in these writings,—an appellation which we are accustomed to apply to those who turn away simple persons, and those who are easily deceived, from sound doctrine. But neither we, nor, I imagine, any other, whether Christian or heretic, know of any who are styled Sirens, who betray and deceive,[5] and stop their ears, and change into swine those whom they delude. And yet this man, who affects to know everything, uses such language as the following: "You may hear," he says, "all those who differ so widely, and who assail each other in their disputes with the most shameless language, uttering the words, 'The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world.'" And this is the only phrase which, it appears, Celsus could remember out of Paul's writings; and yet why should we not also employ innumerable other quotations from the Scriptures, such as, "For though we do walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds,) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God?"[6]

Chapter lxv.

But since he asserts that "you may hear all those who differ

[1] Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1-3.
[2] ἀκοῆς καυστήρια. Cf. note in Benedictine ed.
[3] αἰνίγματα. Cf. note in Benedictine ed.
[4] σκανδάλου. [5] ἐξορχουμένας καὶ σοφιστρίας. [6] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 3.

so widely saying, 'The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world,'" we shall show the falsity of such a statement. For there are certain heretical sects which do not receive the epistles of the Apostle Paul, as the two sects of Ebionites, and those who are termed Encratites. Those, then, who do not regard the apostle as a holy and wise man, will not adopt his language, and say, "The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world." And consequently in this point, too, Celsus is guilty of falsehood. He continues, moreover, to linger over the accusations which he brings against the diversity of sects which exist, but does not appear to me to be accurate in the language which he employs, nor to have carefully observed or understood how it is that those Christians who have made progress in their studies say that they are possessed of greater knowledge than the Jews; and also, whether they acknowledge the same Scriptures, but interpret them differently, or whether they do not recognise these books as divine. For we find both of these views prevailing among the sects. He then continues: "Although they have no foundation for their doctrine, let us examine the system itself; and, in the first place, let us mention the corruptions which they have made through ignorance and misunderstanding, when in the discussion of elementary principles they express their opinions in the most absurd manner on things which they do not understand, such as the following." And then, to certain expressions which are continually in the mouths of the believers in Christianity, he opposes certain others from the writings of the philosophers, with the object of making it appear that the noble sentiments which Celsus supposes to be used by Christians have been expressed in better and clearer language by the philosophers, in order that he might drag away to the study of philosophy those who are caught by opinions which at once evidence their noble and religious character. We shall, however, here terminate the fifth book, and begin the sixth with what follows.

BOOK VI.

Chapter I.

IN beginning this our sixth book, we desire, my reverend Ambrosius, to answer in it those accusations which Celsus brings against the *Christians*, not, as might be supposed, those objections which he has adduced from *writers on philosophy*. For he has quoted a considerable number of passages, chiefly from Plato, and has placed alongside of these such declarations of Holy Scripture as are fitted to impress even the intelligent mind; subjoining the assertion, that "these things are stated much better among the Greeks [than in the Scriptures], and in a manner which is free from all exaggerations[1] and promises on the part of God, or the Son of God." Now we maintain, that if it is the object of the ambassadors of the truth to confer benefits upon the greatest possible number, and, so far as they can, to win over to its side, through their love to men, every one without exception—intelligent as well as simple—not Greeks only, but also barbarians (and great, indeed, is the humanity which should succeed in converting the rustic and the ignorant[2]), it is manifest that they must adopt a style of address fitted to do good to all, and to gain over to them men of every sort. Those, on the other hand, who turn away[3] from the ignorant as being mere slaves,[4] and unable to understand the flowing periods of a polished and logical discourse, and so devote their attention solely to such as have been brought up amongst literary pursuits,[5]

[1] ἀνατάσεως.

[2] πολὺ δὲ τὸ ἥμερον ἐὰν . . . οἷός τέ τις γένηται ἐπιστρέφειν.

[3] πολλὰ χαίρειν Φράσαντες.

[4] ἀνδραπόδοις.

[5] καὶ μὴ οἵοις τε κατακούειν τῆς ἐν Φράσει λόγων καὶ τάξει ἀπαγγελλομένων ἀκολουθίας, μόνων ἐΦρόντισαν τῶν ἀνατραΦέντων ἐν λόγοις καὶ μαθήμασιν.

confine their views of the public good within very strait and narrow limits.

Chapter ii.

I have made these remarks in reply to the charges which Celsus and others bring against the simplicity of the language of Scripture, which appears to be thrown into the shade by the splendour of polished discourse. For our prophets, and Jesus Himself, and His apostles, were careful to adopt[1] a style of address which should not merely convey the truth, but which should be fitted to gain over the multitude, until each one, attracted and led onwards, should ascend as far as he could towards the comprehension of those mysteries which are contained in these apparently simple words. For, if I may venture to say so, few have been benefited (if they have indeed been benefited at all) by the beautiful and polished style of Plato, and those who have written like him; while, on the contrary, many have received advantage from those who wrote and taught in a simple and practical manner, and with a view to the wants of the multitude. It is easy, indeed, to observe that Plato is found only in the hands of those who profess to be literary men;[2] while Epictetus is admired by persons of ordinary capacity, who have a desire to be benefited, and who perceive the improvement which may be derived from his writings. Now we make these remarks, not to disparage Plato (for the great world of men has found even him useful), but to point out the aim of those who said: "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that our faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."[3] For the word of God declares that the preaching (although in itself true and most worthy of belief) is not sufficient to reach the human heart, unless a certain power be imparted to the speaker from God, and a grace appear upon his words; and it is only by the divine agency that this takes place in those who speak effectually. The prophet says in the sixty-seventh Psalm, that "the Lord will give a word with great power to them who preach."[4]

[1] ἐνεῖδον. [2] φιλολόγων. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

[4] Such is the reading of the Septuagint version. The Masoretic text has:

If, then, it should be granted with respect to certain points, that the same doctrines are found among the Greeks as in our own Scriptures, yet they do not possess the same power of attracting and disposing the souls of men to follow them. And therefore the disciples of Jesus, men ignorant so far as regards Grecian philosophy, yet traversed many countries of the world, impressing, agreeably to the desire of the Logos, each one of their hearers according to his deserts, so that they received a moral amelioration in proportion to the inclination of their will to accept of that which is good.

Chapter III.

Let the ancient sages, then, make known their sayings to those who are capable of understanding them. Suppose that Plato, for example, the son of Ariston, in one of his Epistles, is discoursing about the "chief good," and that he says, "The chief good can by no means be described in words, but is produced by long habit, and bursts forth suddenly as a light in the soul, as from a fire which had leapt forth." We, then, on hearing these words, admit that they are well said, for it is God who revealed to men these as well as all other noble expressions. And for this reason it is that we maintain that those who have entertained correct ideas regarding God, but who have not offered to Him a worship in harmony with the truth, are liable to the punishments which fall on sinners. For respecting such Paul says in express words: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible

"The Lord gave a word; of them who published it there was a great host."

God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."[1] The truth, then, is verily held [in unrighteousness], as our Scriptures testify, by those who are of opinion that "the chief good cannot be described in words," but who assert that, "after long custom and familiar usage,[2] a light becomes suddenly kindled in the soul, as if by a fire springing forth, and that it now supports itself alone."

Chapter IV.

Notwithstanding, those who have written in this manner regarding the "chief good" will go down to the Piræus and offer prayer to Artemis, as if she were God, and will look [with approval] upon the solemn assembly held by ignorant men; and after giving utterance to philosophical remarks of such profundity regarding the soul, and describing its passage [to a happier world] after a virtuous life, they pass from those great topics which God has revealed to them, and adopt mean and trifling thoughts, and offer a cock to Esculapius![3] And although they had been enabled to form representations both of the "invisible things" of God and of the "archetypal forms" of things from the creation of the world, and from [the contemplation of] sensible things, from which they ascend to those objects which are comprehended by the understanding alone, — and although they had no mean glimpses of His "eternal power and Godhead,"[4] they nevertheless became "foolish in their imaginations," and their "foolish heart" was involved in darkness and ignorance as to the [true] worship of God. Moreover, we may see those who greatly pride themselves upon their wisdom and theology worshipping the image of a corruptible man, *in honour*, they say, of Him, and sometimes even descending, with the Egyptians, to the worship of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things! And

[1] Cf. Rom. i. 18–23.

[2] ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας γινομένης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ, καὶ τοῦ συζῆν.

[3] Cf. Plato, *Phædo.*

[4] καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὰς ἰδέας Φανταςθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἀφ' ὧν ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐπὶ τὰ νοούμενα· τὴν τε ἀΐδιον αὐτοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεότητα οὐκ ἀγεννῶς ἰδόντες, etc.

although some may appear to have risen above such practices, nevertheless they will be found to have changed the truth of God into a lie, and to worship and serve the "creature more than the Creator."[1] As the wise and learned among the Greeks, then, commit errors in the service which they render to God, God "chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and base things of the world, and things that are weak, and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are;"[2] and this, truly, "that no flesh should glory in the presence of God." *Our* wise men, however,—Moses, the most ancient of them all, and the prophets who followed him,—knowing that the chief good could by no means be described in words, were the first who wrote that, as God manifests Himself to the deserving, and to those who are qualified to behold Him,[3] He appeared to Abraham, or to Isaac, or to Jacob. But who He was that appeared, and of what form, and in what manner, and like to which of mortal beings,[4] they have left to be investigated by those who are able to show that they resemble those persons to whom God showed Himself: for He was seen not by their bodily eyes, but by the pure heart. For, according to the declaration of our Jesus, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."[5]

Chapter V.

But that a light is suddenly kindled in the soul, as by a fire leaping forth, is a fact known long ago to our Scriptures; as when the prophet said, "Light ye for yourselves the light of knowledge."[6] John also, who lived after him, said, "That which was in the Logos was life, and the life was the light of

[1] Rom. i. 25.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 27, 28, 29.

[3] ἐπιτηδείοις.

[4] καὶ τινι τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν. Boherellus understands ὅμοιος, which has been adopted in the translation.

[5] Cf. Matt. v. 8.

[6] Hos. x. 12. φωτίσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς γνώσεως (LXX.). The Masoretic text is, נִירוּ לָכֶם נִיר וְעֵת דָּרְשׁוּ, where for וְעֵת (*and time*) the Septuagint translator apparently read דעת (*knowledge*), ד and ו being interchanged from their similarity.

men;"[1] which "true light lighteneth every man that cometh into the world" (*i.e.* the true world, which is perceived by the understanding[2]), and maketh him a light of the world: "For this light shone in our hearts, to give the light of the glorious gospel of God in the face of Christ Jesus."[3] And therefore that very ancient prophet, who prophesied many generations before the reign of Cyrus (for he was older than he by more than fourteen generations), expressed himself in these words: "The Lord is my light and my salvation: whom shall I fear?"[4] and, "Thy law is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path;"[5] and again, "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, was manifested towards us;"[6] and, "In Thy light we shall see light."[7] And the Logos, exhorting us to come to this light, says, in the prophecies of Isaiah: "Enlighten thyself, enlighten thyself, O Jerusalem; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."[8] The same prophet also, when predicting the advent of Jesus, who was to turn away men from the worship of idols, and of images, and of demons, says, "To those that sat in the land and shadow of death, upon them hath the light arisen;"[9] and again, "The people that sat in darkness saw a great light."[10] Observe now the difference between the fine phrases of Plato respecting the "chief good," and the declarations of our prophets regarding the "light" of the blessed; and notice that the truth as it is contained in Plato concerning this subject did not at all help his readers to attain to a pure worship of God, nor even himself, who could philosophize so grandly about the "chief good," whereas the simple language of the Holy Scriptures has led to their honest readers being filled with a divine spirit;[11] and this light is nourished within them by the oil, which in a certain parable is said to have preserved the light of the torches of the five wise virgins.[12]

[1] Cf. John i. 3, 4.
[2] τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ νοητόν.
[3] Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6.
[4] Ps. xxvii. 1 (attributed to David).
[5] Ps. cxix. 105.
[6] Ps. iv. 6 (Heb. "Lift upon us," etc.).
[7] Ps. xxxvi. 9.
[8] Cf. Isa. lx. 1.
[9] Cf. Isa. ix. 2.
[10] Cf. Isa. ix. 2.
[11] ἐνθουσιᾶν.
[12] Cf. Matt. xxv. 4.

Chapter vi.

Seeing, however, that Celsus quotes from an epistle of Plato another statement to the following effect, viz.: "If it appeared to me that these matters could be adequately explained to the multitude in writing and in oral address, what nobler pursuit in life could have been followed by me, than to commit to writing what was to prove of such advantage to human beings, and to lead the nature of all men onwards to the light?"—let us then consider this point briefly, viz. whether or not Plato were acquainted with any doctrines more profound than are contained in his writings, or more divine than those which he has left behind him, leaving it to each one to investigate the subject according to his ability, while we demonstrate that our prophets did know of greater things than any in the Scriptures, but which they did not commit to writing. Ezekiel, *e.g.*, received a roll,[1] written within and without, in which were contained "lamentations," and "songs," and "denunciations;"[2] but at the command of the Logos he swallowed the book, in order that its contents might not be written, and so made known to unworthy persons. John also is recorded to have seen and done a similar thing.[3] Nay, Paul even heard "unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."[4] And it is related of Jesus, who was greater than all these, that He conversed with His disciples in private, and especially in their secret retreats, concerning the gospel of God; but the words which He uttered have not been preserved, because it appeared to the evangelists that they could not be adequately conveyed to the multitude in writing or in speech. And if it were not tiresome to repeat the truth regarding these illustrious individuals, I would say that they saw better than Plato (by means of the intelligence which they received by the grace of God), what things were to be committed to *writing*, and how this was to be done, and what was by no means to be written to the multitude, and what was to be expressed in *words*, and what was not to be so conveyed. And once more, John, in teaching us the difference between what ought to be committed to writing and what not,

[1] κεφαλίδα βιβλίου.
[2] οὐαί; cf. Ezek. ii. 9, 10.
[3] Cf. Apoc. x. 9.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 4.

declares that he heard seven thunders instructing him on certain matters, and forbidding him to commit their words to writing.[1]

Chapter vii.

There might also be found in the writings of Moses and of the prophets, who are older not only than Plato, but even than Homer and the invention of letters among the Greeks, passages worthy of the grace of God bestowed upon them, and filled with great thoughts, to which they gave utterance, but not because they understood Plato imperfectly, as Celsus imagines. For how was it possible that they should have heard one who was not yet born? And if any one should apply the words of Celsus to the apostles of Jesus, who were younger than Plato, say whether it is not on the very face of it an incredible assertion, that Paul the tentmaker, and Peter the fisherman, and John who left his father's nets, should, through misunderstanding the language of Plato in his Epistles, have expressed themselves as they have done regarding God? But as Celsus now, after having often required of us immediate assent [to his views], as if he were babbling forth something new in addition to what he has already advanced, only repeats himself,[2] what we have said in reply may suffice. Seeing, however, he produces another quotation from Plato, in which he asserts that the employment of the method of question and answer sheds light on the thoughts of those who philosophize like him, let us show from the Holy Scriptures that the word of God also encourages us to the practice of dialectics: Solomon, *e.g.*, declaring in one passage, that "instruction unquestioned goes astray;"[3] and Jesus the son of Sirach, who has left us the treatise called "Wisdom," declaring in another, that "the knowledge of the unwise is as words that will not stand in-

[1] Cf. Apoc. x. 4.

[2] πολλάκις δὲ ἤδη ὁ Κέλσος θρυλλήσας ὡς ἀξιούμενον εὐθέως πιστεύειν, ὡς καινόν τι παρὰ τὰ πρότερον εἰρημένα. Guietus thus amends the passage: πολλάκις δὲ ἤδη ὁ Κέλσος ἀξιούμενος εὐθέως πιστεύειν, ὡς καινόν τι παρὰ τὰ πρότερον εἰρημένα θρυλλήσας, etc. Boherellus would change ἀξιούμενον into ἀξιοῦμεν.

[3] παιδεία ἀνεξέλεγκτος πλανᾶται; cf. Prov. x. 17.

vestigation."[1] Our methods of discussion, however, are rather of a gentle kind; for we have learned that he who presides over the preaching of the word ought to be able to confute gainsayers. But if some continue indolent, and do not train themselves so as to attend to the reading of the word, and "to search the Scriptures," and, agreeably to the command of Jesus, to investigate the *meaning* of the sacred writings, and to ask of God concerning them, and to keep "knocking" at what may be closed within them, the Scripture is not on that account to be regarded as devoid of wisdom.

Chapter viii.

In the next place, after other Platonic declarations, which demonstrate that "the good" can be known by few, he adds: "Since the multitude, being puffed up with a contempt for others, which is far from right, and being filled with vain and lofty hopes, assert that, because they have come to the knowledge of some venerable doctrines, certain things are true." "Yet although Plato predicted these things, he nevertheless does not talk marvels,[2] nor shut the mouth of those who wish to ask him for information on the subject of his promises; nor does he command them to come at once and believe that a God of a particular kind exists, and that he has a son of a particular nature, who descended [to earth] and conversed with me." Now, in answer to this we have to say, that with regard to Plato, it is Aristander, I think, who has related that he was not the son of Ariston, but of a phantom, which approached Amphictione in the guise of Apollo. And there are several other of the followers of Plato who, in their lives of their master, have made the same statement. What are we to say, moreover, about Pythagoras, who relates the greatest possible amount of wonders, and who, in a general assembly of the Greeks, showed his ivory thigh, and asserted that he recognised the shield which he wore when he was Euphorbus, and who is said to have appeared on one day in two different cities! He, moreover, who will declare that what is related of Plato and Socrates belongs to the marvellous, will quote the story of

[1] γνῶσις ἀσυνέτου, ἀδιεξέταστοι λόγοι; cf. Ecclus. xxi. 18.

[2] οὐ τερατεύεται.

the swan which was recommended to Socrates while he was asleep, and of the master saying when he met the young man, "This, then, was the swan!"[1] Nay, the third eye which Plato saw that he himself possessed, he will refer to the category of prodigies.[2] But occasion for slanderous accusations will never be wanting to those who are ill-disposed, and who wish to speak evil of what has happened to such as are raised above the multitude. Such persons will deride as a fiction even the demon of Socrates. We do not, then, relate marvels when we narrate the history of Jesus, nor have His genuine disciples recorded any such stories of Him; whereas this Celsus, who professes universal knowledge, and who quotes many of the sayings of Plato, is, I think, intentionally silent on the discourse concerning the Son of God which is related in Plato's epistle to Hermeas and Coriscus. Plato's words are as follows: "And calling to witness the God of all things—the ruler both of things present and things to come, father and lord both of the ruler and cause—whom, if we are philosophers indeed, we shall all clearly know, so far as it is possible for happy human beings to attain such knowledge."[3]

Chapter ix.

Celsus quotes another saying of Plato to the following effect: "It has occurred to me to speak once more upon these subjects at greater length, as perhaps I might express myself about them more clearly than I have already done: for there is a certain 'real' cause, which proves a hindrance in the way of him who has ventured, even to a slight extent, to write on such topics; and as this has been frequently mentioned by me on former occasions, it appears to me that it ought to be stated now. In each of existing things, which are necessarily employed in the acquisition of knowledge, there are three ele-

[1] The night before Ariston brought Plato to Socrates as his pupil, the latter dreamed that a swan from the altar of Cupid alighted on his bosom. Cf. Pausanias in *Atticis*, p. 58.

[2] "Alicubi forsan occurrit: me vero uspiam legisse non memini. Credo Platonem per tertium oculum suam πολυμάθειαν et scientiam, quâ ceteris anteibat, denotare voluisse."—Spencer.

[3] Plato, *Epist.* vi.

ments; knowledge itself is the fourth; and that ought to be laid down as the fifth which is both capable of being known and is true. Of these, one is 'name;' the second is 'word;' the third, 'image;' the fourth, 'knowledge.'"[1] Now, according to this division, John is introduced before Jesus as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, so as to correspond with the "name" of Plato; and the second after John, who is pointed out by him, is Jesus, with whom agrees the statement, "The Word became flesh," and that corresponds to the "word" of Plato. Plato terms the third "image;" but we, who apply the expression "image" to something different, would say with greater precision, that the mark of the wounds which is made in the soul by the word is the Christ which is in each one of us, and this mark is impressed by Christ the Word.[2] And whether Christ, the wisdom which is in those of us who are perfect, correspond to the "fourth" element—knowledge—will become known to him who has the capacity to ascertain it.

Chapter X.

He next continues: "You see how Plato, although maintaining that [the chief good] cannot be described in words, yet, to avoid the appearance of retreating to an irrefutable position, subjoins a reason in explanation of this difficulty, as even 'nothing'[3] might perhaps be explained in words." But as Celsus adduces this to prove that we ought not to yield a simple assent, but to furnish a reason for our belief, we shall quote also the words of Paul, where he says, in censuring the hasty[4] believer, "unless ye have believed inconsiderately."[5] Now, through his practice of repeating himself, Celsus, so far as he can, forces us to be guilty of tautology, reiterating, after the boastful language which has been quoted, that "Plato is not guilty of boasting and falsehood, giving out that he has made some new discovery, or that he has come down from

[1] *ὧν ἓν μὲν, ὄνομα· δεύτερον δὲ, λόγος· τὸ δὲ τρίτον, εἴδωλον· τὸ τέταρτον δὲ, ἐπιστήμη.*

[2] *τρανότερον φήσομεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γινόμενον μετὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν τραυμάτων τύπον, τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἐν ἑκάστῳ Χριστὸν, ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ λόγου.*

[3] *τὸ μηδέν.* [4] *εἰκῇ πιστεύοντι.* [5] 1 Cor. xv. 2.

heaven to announce it, but acknowledges whence these statements are derived." Now, if one wished to reply to Celsus, one might say in answer to such assertions, that even Plato *is* guilty of boasting, when in the *Timæus* he puts the following language in the mouth of Zeus: "Gods of gods, whose creator and father I am," and so on. And if any one will defend such language on account of the meaning which is conveyed under the name of Zeus, thus speaking in the dialogue of Plato, why should not he who investigates the meaning of the words of the Son of God, or those of the Creator[1] in the prophets, express a profounder meaning than any conveyed by the words of Zeus in the *Timæus?* For the characteristic of divinity is the announcement of future events, predicted not by human power, but shown by the result to be due to a divine spirit in him who made the announcement. Accordingly, we do not say to each of our hearers, "Believe, first of all, that He whom I introduce to thee is the Son of God;" but we put the gospel before each one, as his character and disposition may fit him to receive it, inasmuch as we have learned to know "how we ought to answer every man."[2] And there are some who are capable of receiving nothing more than an exhortation to believe, and to these we address that alone; while we approach others, again, as far as possible, in the way of demonstration, by means of question and answer. Nor do we at all say, as Celsus scoffingly alleges, "Believe that He whom I introduce to thee is the Son of God, although He was shamefully bound, and disgracefully punished, and very recently[3] was most contumeliously treated before the eyes of all men;" neither do we add, "Believe it even the more [on that account]." For it is our endeavour to state, on each individual point, arguments more numerous even than we have brought forward in the preceding pages.

Chapter xi.

After this Celsus continues: "If these (meaning the Christians) bring forward this person, and others, again, a different individual [as the Christ], while the common and ready cry[4] of

[1] τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. [2] Cf. Col. iv. 6. [3] χθὲς καὶ πρώην.
[4] κοινὸν δὲ πάντων ἢ καὶ πρόχειρον. For ἢ, Boherellus reads ἦ.

all parties is, 'Believe, if thou wilt be saved, or else begone,' what shall those do who are in earnest about their salvation? Shall they cast the dice, in order to divine whither they may betake themselves, and whom they shall join?" Now we shall answer this objection in the following manner, as the clearness of the case impels us to do. If it had been recorded that several individuals had appeared in human life as sons of God in the manner in which Jesus did, and if each of them had drawn a party of adherents to his side, so that, on account of the similarity of the profession [in the case of each individual] that he was the Son of God, he to whom his followers bore testimony to that effect was an object of dispute, there would have been ground for his saying, "If these bring forward this person, and others a different individual, while the common and ready cry of all parties is, 'Believe, if thou wilt be saved, or else begone,'" and so on; whereas it has been proclaimed to the entire world that Jesus Christ is the only Son of God who visited the human race: for those who, like Celsus, have supposed that [the acts of Jesus] were a series of prodigies,[1] and who for that reason wished to perform acts of the same kind,[2] that they, too, might gain a similar mastery over the minds of men, were convicted of being utter nonentities.[3] Such were Simon, the Magus of Samaria, and Dositheus, who was a native of the same place; since the former gave out that he was the power of God that is called great,[4] and the latter that he was the Son of God. Now Simonians are found nowhere throughout the world; and yet, in order to gain over to himself many followers, Simon freed his disciples from the danger of death, which the Christians were taught to prefer, by teaching them to regard idolatry as a matter of indifference. But even at the beginning of their existence the followers of Simon were not exposed to persecution. For that wicked demon who was conspiring against the doctrine of Jesus, was well aware that none of his own maxims would be weakened by the teach-

[1] οἱ γὰρ ὁμοίως Κελσῷ ὑπολαβόντες τετερατεῦσθαι. The word ὁμοίως formerly stood, in the text of Spencer and Ruæus, before τετερατεῦσθαι, but is properly expunged, as arising from the preceding ὁμοίως. Boherellus remarks: "Forte aliud quid exciderit, verbi gratiâ, τὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ."

[2] τερατεύσασθαι. [3] τὸ οὐδέν. [4] Cf. Acts viii. 10.

ing of Simon. The Dositheans, again, even in former times, did not rise to any eminence, and now they are completely extinguished, so that it is said their whole number does not amount to thirty. Judas of Galilee also, as Luke relates in the Acts of the Apostles,[1] wished to call himself some great personage, as did Theudas before him; but as their doctrine was not of God, they were destroyed, and all who obeyed them were immediately dispersed. We do not, then, "cast the dice in order to divine whither we shall betake ourselves, and whom we shall join," as if there were many claimants able to draw us after them by the profession of their having come down from God to visit the human race. On these points, however, we have said enough.

Chapter xii.

Accordingly, let us pass on to another charge made by Celsus, who is not even acquainted with the words [of our sacred books], but who, from misunderstanding them, has said that "we declare the wisdom that is among men to be foolishness with God;" Paul having said that "the wisdom of the *world* is foolishness with God."[2] Celsus says that "the reason of this has been stated long ago." And the reason he imagines to be, "our desire to win over by means of this saying the ignorant and foolish alone." But, as he himself has intimated, he has said the same thing before; and we, to the best of our ability, replied to it. Notwithstanding this, however, he wished to show that this statement was an invention[3] of ours, and borrowed from the Grecian sages, who declare that human wisdom is of one kind, and divine of another. And he quotes the words of Heraclitus, where he says in one passage, that "man's method of action is not regulated by fixed principles, but that of God is;"[4] and in another, that "a foolish man listens to a demon, as a boy does to a man." He quotes, moreover, the following from the *Apology of Socrates*, of which Plato was the author: "For I, O men of Athens, have obtained this name by no other means than by my wisdom. And of what sort is this wisdom? Such, probably, as is human; for

[1] Cf. Acts v. 36, 37. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 19. [3] πεπλασμένον ἡμῖν.
[4] ἦθος γὰρ ἀνθρώπειον μὲν οὐκ ἔχει γνώμας, θεῖον δὲ ἔχει.

in that respect I venture to think that I am in reality wise."[1] Such are the passages adduced by Celsus. But I shall subjoin also the following from Plato's letter to Hermeas, and Erastus, and Coriscus: "To Erastus and Coriscus I say, although I am an old man, that, in addition to this noble knowledge of 'forms' [which they possess], they need a wisdom, with regard to the class of wicked and unjust persons, which may serve as a protective and repelling force against them. For they are inexperienced, in consequence of having passed a large portion of their lives with us, who are moderate[2] individuals, and not wicked. I have accordingly said that they need these things, in order that they may not be compelled to neglect the true wisdom, and to apply themselves in a greater degree than is proper to that which is necessary and human."

Chapter xiii.

According to the foregoing, then, the one kind of wisdom is human, and the other divine. Now the "human" wisdom is that which is termed by us the wisdom of the "world," which is "foolishness with God;" whereas the "divine"—being different from the "human," because it is "divine"—comes, through the grace of God who bestows it, to those who have evinced their capacity for receiving it, and especially to those who, from knowing the difference between either kind of wisdom, say, in their prayers to God, "Even if one among the sons of men be perfect, while the wisdom is wanting that comes from Thee, he shall be accounted as nothing."[3] We maintain, indeed, that "human" wisdom is an exercise for the soul, but that "divine" wisdom is the "end," being also termed the "strong" meat of the soul by him who has said that "strong meat belongeth to them that are perfect,[4] even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."[5] This opinion, moreover, is truly an ancient one, its antiquity not being referred back, as Celsus thinks, merely to Heraclitus and Plato. For before these individuals lived, the prophets distinguished between the two kinds of wisdom. It is sufficient for the present to quote from the words of David

[1] Cf. Plato's *Apolog.*
[2] μετρίων ὄντων.
[3] Cf. Wisd. of Sol. ix. 6.
[4] τέλειοι.
[5] Heb. v. 14.

what he says regarding the man who is wise, according to divine wisdom, that "he will not see corruption when he beholds wise men dying."[1] Divine wisdom, accordingly, being different from faith, is the "first" of the so-called "charismata" of God; and the "second" after it—in the estimation of those who know how to distinguish such things accurately—is what is called "knowledge;"[2] and the "third"—seeing that even the more simple class of men who adhere to the service of God, so far as they can, must be saved—is faith. And therefore Paul says: "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit."[3] And therefore it is no ordinary individuals whom you will find to have participated in the "divine" wisdom, but the more excellent and distinguished among those who have given in their adherence to Christianity; for it is not "to the most ignorant, or servile, or most uninstructed of mankind," that one would discourse upon the topics relating to the divine wisdom.

Chapter xiv.

In designating others by the epithets of "uninstructed, and servile, and ignorant," Celsus, I suppose, means those who are not acquainted with his laws, nor trained in the branches of Greek learning; while we, on the other hand, deem those to be "uninstructed" who are not ashamed to address [supplications] to inanimate objects, and to call upon those for health that have no strength, and to ask the dead for life, and to entreat the helpless for assistance.[4] And although some may say that these objects are not gods, but only imitations and symbols of real divinities, nevertheless these very individuals, in imagining that the hands of low mechanics[5] can frame imitations of divinity, are "uninstructed, and servile, and ignorant;" for we assert that the lowest[6] among us have been set free from this ignorance and want of knowledge, while the most intelligent

[1] Ps. xlix. 9, 10 (LXX.). [2] γνῶσις. [3] 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

[4] τοὺς μὴ αἰσχυνομένους ἐν τῷ τοῖς ἀψύχοις προσλαλεῖν, καὶ περὶ μὲν ὑγείας τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἐπικαλουμένους, περὶ δὲ ζωῆς τὸ νεκρὸν ἀξιοῦντας, περὶ δὲ ἐπικουρίας τὸ ἀπορώτατον ἱκετεύοντας.

[5] βαναύσων. [6] τοὺς ἐσχάτους.

can understand and grasp the divine hope. We do *not* maintain, however, that it is impossible for one who has not been trained in earthly wisdom to receive the "divine," but we *do* acknowledge that all human wisdom is "folly" in comparison with the "divine." In the next place, instead of endeavouring to adduce reasons, as he ought, for his assertions, he terms us "sorcerers,"[1] and asserts that "we flee away with headlong speed[2] from the more polished[3] class of persons, because they are not suitable subjects for our impositions, while we seek to decoy[4] those who are more rustic." Now he did not observe that from the very beginning our wise men were trained in the external branches of learning: Moses, *e.g.*, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; Daniel, and Ananias, and Azariah, and Mishael, in all Assyrian learning, so that they were found to surpass in tenfold degree all the wise men of that country. At the present time, moreover, the churches have, in proportion to the multitudes [of ordinary believers], a few "wise" men, who have come over to them from that wisdom which is said by us to be "according to the flesh;"[5] and they have also some who have advanced from it to that wisdom which is "divine."

Chapter xv.

Celsus, in the next place, as one who has heard the subject of humility greatly talked about,[6] but who has not been at the pains to understand it,[7] would wish to speak evil of that humility which is practised among us, and imagines that it is borrowed from some words of Plato imperfectly understood, where he expresses himself in the *Laws* as follows: "Now God, according to the ancient account, having in Himself both the beginning and end and middle of all existing things, proceeds according to nature, and marches straight on.[8] He is constantly followed by justice, which is the avenger of all breaches of the divine law: he who is about to become happy follows her closely in humility, and becomingly adorned."[9] He did not observe, however, that

[1] γόητας. [2] προτροπάδην. [3] τοὺς χαριεστέρους.
[4] παλεύομεν. [5] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 26.
[6] ὡς περιηχηθεὶς τὰ περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης.
[7] μὴ ἐπιμελῶς αὐτὴν νοήσας.
[8] εὐθείᾳ περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν παραπορευόμενος. [9] Plato, *de Legibus*, iv.

in writers much older than Plato the following words occur in a prayer: "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty, neither do I walk in great matters, nor in things too wonderful for me; if I had not been humble,"[1] etc. Now these words show that he who is of humble mind does not by any means humble himself in an unseemly or inauspicious manner, falling down upon his knees, or casting himself headlong on the ground, putting on the dress of the miserable, or sprinkling himself with dust. But he who is of humble mind in the sense of the prophet, while "walking in great and wonderful things," which are above his capacity—viz. those doctrines that are truly great, and those thoughts that are wonderful—"humbles himself under the mighty hand of God." If there are some, however, who through their stupidity[2] have not clearly understood the doctrine of humiliation, and act as they do, it is not our doctrine which is to be blamed; but we must extend our forgiveness to the stupidity[2] of those who aim at higher things, and owing to their fatuity of mind[3] fail to attain them. He who is "humble and becomingly adorned," is so in a greater degree than Plato's "humble and becomingly adorned" individual: for he is becomingly adorned, on the one hand, because "he walks in things great and wonderful," which are beyond his capacity; and humble, on the other hand, because, while being in the midst of such, he yet voluntarily humbles himself, not under any one at random, but under "the mighty hand of God," through Jesus Christ, the teacher of such instruction, "who did not deem equality with God a thing to be eagerly clung to, but made Himself of no reputation, and took on Him the form of a servant, and being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."[4] And so great is this doctrine of humiliation, that it has no ordinary individual as its teacher; but our great Saviour Himself says: "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls."[5]

[1] Ps. cxxxi. 1, 2 (LXX.). The clause, "If I had not been humble," seems to belong to the following verse.

[2] τῇ ἰδιωτείᾳ.

[3] διὰ τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν.

[4] Cf. Phil. ii. 6, 8.

[5] Cf. Matt. xi. 20.

Chapter xvi.

In the next place, with regard to the declaration of Jesus against rich men, when He said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,"[1] Celsus alleges that this saying manifestly proceeded from Plato, and that Jesus perverted the words of the philosopher, which were, that "it was impossible to be distinguished for goodness, and at the same time for riches."[2] Now who is there that is capable of giving even moderate attention to affairs—not merely among the believers on Jesus, but among the rest of mankind—that would not laugh at Celsus, on hearing that Jesus, who was born and brought up among the Jews, and was supposed to be the son of Joseph the carpenter, and who had not studied literature—not merely that of the Greeks, but not even that of the Hebrews—as the truth-loving Scriptures testify regarding Him,[3] had read Plato, and being pleased with the opinion he expressed regarding rich men, to the effect that "it was impossible to be distinguished for goodness and riches at the same time," had perverted this, and changed it into, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God!" Now, if Celsus had not perused the Gospels in a spirit of hatred and dislike, but had been imbued with a love of truth, he would have turned his attention to the point why a camel—that one of animals which, as regards its physical structure, is crooked—was chosen as an object of comparison with a rich man, and what signification the "narrow eye of a needle" had for him who saw that "strait and narrow was the way that leadeth unto life;"[4] and to this point also, that this animal, according to the law, is described as "unclean," having one element of acceptability, viz. that it ruminates, but one of condemnation, viz. that it does not divide the hoof. He would have inquired, moreover, how often the camel was adduced as an object of comparison in the sacred Scriptures, and in reference to what objects, that he might thus ascertain the meaning of the Logos concerning the

[1] Cf. Matt. xix. 24.
[2] Cf. Plato, v. *de Legibus.*
[3] Cf. Matt. xiii. 54, Mark vi. 2, and John vii. 15.
[4] Cf. Matt. vii. 14.

rich men. Nor would he have left without examination the fact that "the poor" are termed "blessed" by Jesus, while "the rich" are designated as "miserable;" and whether these words refer to the rich and poor who are visible to the senses, or whether there is any kind of poverty known to the Logos which is to be deemed "altogether blessed," and any rich man who is to be wholly condemned. For even a common individual would not thus indiscriminately have praised the poor, many of whom lead most wicked lives. But on this point we have said enough.

Chapter xvii.

Since Celsus, moreover, from a desire to depreciate the accounts which our Scriptures give of the kingdom of God, has quoted none of them, as if they were unworthy of being recorded by him (or perhaps because he was unacquainted with them), while, on the other hand, he quotes the sayings of Plato, both from his *Epistles* and the *Phædrus*, as if these were divinely inspired, but our Scriptures were not, let us set forth a few points, for the sake of comparison with these plausible declarations of Plato, which did not, however, dispose the philosopher to worship in a manner worthy of him the Maker of all things. For he ought not to have adulterated or polluted this worship with what we call "idolatry," but what the many would describe by the term "superstition." Now, according to a Hebrew figure of speech, it is said of God in the eighteenth Psalm, that "He made darkness His secret place,"[1] to signify that those notions which should be worthily entertained of God are invisible and unknowable, because God conceals Himself in darkness, as it were, from those who cannot endure the splendours of His knowledge, or are incapable of looking at them, partly owing to the pollution of their understanding, which is clothed with the body of mortal lowliness, and partly owing to its feebler power of comprehending God. And in order that it may appear that the knowledge of God has rarely been vouchsafed to men, and has been found in very few individuals, Moses is related to have entered into the darkness where God was.[2] And again, with regard to Moses it is said: "Moses

[1] Cf. Ps. xviii. 11.

[1] Cf. Ex. xx. 21.

alone shall come near the Lord, but the rest shall not come nigh."[1] And again, that the prophet may show the depth of the doctrines which relate to God, and which is unattainable by those who do not possess the "Spirit which searcheth all things, even the deep things of God," he added: "The abyss like a garment is His covering."[2] Nay, our Lord and Saviour, the Logos of God, manifesting that the greatness of the knowledge of the Father is appropriately comprehended and known pre-eminently by Him alone, and in the second place by those whose minds are enlightened by the Logos Himself and God, declares: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."[3] For no one can worthily know the "uncreated"[4] and first-born of all created nature like the Father who begat Him, nor any one the Father like the living Logos, and His Wisdom and Truth. By sharing in Him who takes away from the Father what is called "darkness," which He "made His secret place," and "the abyss," which is called His "covering," and in this way unveiling the Father, every one knows the Father who[5] is capable of knowing Him.

Chapter xviii.

I thought it right to quote these few instances from a much larger number of passages, in which our sacred writers express their ideas regarding God, in order to show that, to those who have eyes to behold the venerable character of Scripture, the sacred writings of the prophets contain things more worthy of reverence than those sayings of Plato which Celsus admires. Now the declaration of Plato, quoted by Celsus, runs as follows: "All things are around the King of all, and all things exist for his sake, and he is the cause of all good things. With things of the second rank he is second, and with those of the third rank he is third. The human soul, accordingly,

[1] Cf. Ex. xxiv. 2. [2] Cf. Ps. civ. 6. [3] Cf. Matt. xi. 27.

[4] *ἀγένητον.* Locus diligenter notandus, ubi filius e creaturarum numero diserte eximitur, dum *ἀγένητος* dicitur. At non dissimulandum in unico Cod. Anglicano secundo legi: *τὸν γεννητόν*: cf. *Origenianorum*, lib. ii. quæstio 2, num. 23.—Ruæus.

[5] *ὅτί ποτ' ἂν χωρῇ γιγνώσκειν.* Boherellus proposes *ὅστις ποτ' ἂν χωρῇ*, etc.

is eager to learn what these things are, looking to such things as are kindred to itself, none of which is perfect. But as regards the King and those things which I mentioned, there is nothing which resembles them."[1] I might have mentioned, moreover, what is said of those beings which are called seraphim by the Hebrews, and described in Isaiah,[2] who cover the face and feet of God, and of those called cherubim, whom Ezekiel[3] has described, and the postures of these, and of the manner in which God is said to be borne upon the cherubim. But since they are mentioned in a very mysterious manner, on account of the unworthy and the indecent, who are unable to enter into the great thoughts and venerable nature of theology, I have not deemed it becoming to discourse of them in this treatise.

Chapter xix.

Celsus in the next place alleges, that "certain Christians, having misunderstood the words of Plato, loudly boast of a 'super-celestial' God, thus ascending beyond the heaven of the Jews." By these words, indeed, he does not make it clear whether they also ascend beyond the *God* of the Jews, or only beyond the heaven by which they swear. It is not our purpose at present, however, to speak of those who acknowledge another god than the one worshipped by the Jews, but to defend ourselves, and to show that it was impossible for the prophets of the Jews, whose writings are reckoned among ours, to have borrowed anything from Plato, because they were older than he. They did not then borrow from him the declaration, that "all things are around the King of all, and that all exist on account of him;" for we have learned that nobler thoughts than these have been uttered by the prophets, by Jesus Himself and His disciples, who have clearly indicated the meaning of the spirit that was in them, which was none other than the spirit of Christ. Nor was the philosopher the first to present to view the "super-celestial" place; for David long ago brought to view the profundity and multitude of the thoughts concerning God entertained by those who have ascended above visible things, when he said in the book of Psalms: "Praise God, ye

[1] Cf. Plato, *Epist.* ii. ad Dionys.

[2] Cf. Isa. vi. 2.

[3] Cf. Ezek. i. and x.

heaven of heavens; and ye waters that be above the heavens, let them praise the name of the Lord."[1] I do not, indeed, deny that Plato learned from certain Hebrews the words quoted from the *Phædrus*, or even, as some have recorded, that he quoted them from a perusal of our prophetic writings, when he said: "No poet here below has ever sung of the super-celestial place, or ever will sing in a becoming manner," and so on. And in the same passage is the following: "For the essence, which is both colourless and formless, and which cannot be touched, which really exists, is the pilot of the soul, and is beheld by the understanding alone; and around it the genus of true knowledge holds this place."[2] Our Paul, moreover, educated by these words, and longing after things "supra-mundane" and "super-celestial," and doing his utmost for their sake to attain them, says in the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are unseen are eternal."[3]

Chapter xx.

Now, to those who are capable of understanding him, the apostle manifestly presents to view "things which are the objects of perception," calling them "things seen;" while he terms "unseen," things which are the object of the understanding, and cognisable by it alone. He knows, also, that things "seen" and visible are "temporal," but that things cognisable by the mind, and "not seen," are "eternal;" and desiring to remain in the contemplation of these, and being assisted by his earnest longing for them, he deemed all affliction as "light" and as "nothing," and during the season of afflictions and troubles was not at all bowed down by them, but by his contemplation of [divine] things deemed every calamity a light thing, seeing we also have "a great High Priest," who by the greatness of His power and understanding "has passed through the heavens, even Jesus the Son of God," who has promised to all that have truly learned divine things, and have

[1] Ps. cxlviii. 4. [2] Cf. Plato in *Phædro*. [3] Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

lived lives in harmony with them, to go before them to the things that are supra-mundane; for His words are: "That where I go, ye may be also."[1] And therefore we hope, after the troubles and struggles which we suffer here, to reach the highest heavens,[2] and receiving, agreeably to the teaching of Jesus, the fountains of water that spring up unto eternal life, and being filled with the rivers of knowledge,[3] shall be united with those waters that are said to be above the heavens, and which praise His name. And as many of us[4] as praise Him shall not be carried about by the revolution of the heaven, but shall be ever engaged in the contemplation of the invisible things of God, which are no longer understood by us through the things which He hath made from the creation of the world, but seeing, as it was expressed by the true disciple of Jesus in these words, "then face to face;"[5] and in these, "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part will be done away."[6]

Chapter xxi.

The Scriptures which are current in the churches of God do not speak of "seven" heavens, or of any definite number at all, but they do appear to teach the existence of "heavens," whether that means the "spheres" of those bodies which the Greeks call "planets," or something more mysterious. Celsus, too, agreeably to the opinion of Plato,[7] asserts that souls can make their way to and from the earth through the planets; while Moses, our most ancient prophet, says that a divine vision was presented to the view of our prophet Jacob,[8]—a ladder stretching to heaven, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it, and the Lord supported[9] upon its top,—obscurely pointing, by this matter of the ladder, either to the same truths which Plato had in view, or to something greater than these. On this subject

[1] Cf. John xiv. 3.

[2] πρὸς ἄκροις τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

[3] ποταμοὺς τῶν θεωρήματων.

[4] For ὅσον γε Boherellus proposes ὅσοι γε, which is adopted in the translation.

[5] Cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

[6] Cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 10.

[7] Cf. Plato in *Timæo*.

[8] Cf. Gen. xxviii. 12, 13.

[9] ἐπεστηριγμένον.

Philo has composed a treatise which deserves the thoughtful and intelligent investigation of all lovers of truth.

Chapter XXII.

After this, Celsus, desiring to exhibit his learning in his treatise against us, quotes also certain Persian mysteries, where he says: "These things are obscurely hinted at in the accounts of the Persians, and especially in the mysteries of Mithras, which are celebrated amongst them. For in the latter there is a representation of the two heavenly revolutions,—of the movement, viz., of the fixed[1] stars, and of that which takes place among the planets, and of the passage of the soul through these. The representation is of the following nature: There is a ladder with lofty gates,[2] and on the top of it an eighth gate. The first gate consists of lead, the second of tin, the third of copper, the fourth of iron, the fifth of a mixture of metals,[3] the sixth of silver, and the seventh of gold. The first gate they assign to Saturn, indicating by the 'lead' the slowness of this star; the second to Venus, comparing her to the splendour and softness of tin; the third to Jupiter, being firm[4] and solid; the fourth to Mercury, for both Mercury and iron are fit to endure all things, and are money-making and laborious;[5] the fifth to Mars, because, being composed of a mixture of metals, it is varied and unequal; the sixth, of silver, to the Moon; the seventh, of gold, to the Sun,—thus imitating the different colours of the two latter." He next proceeds to examine the reason of the stars being arranged in this order, which is symbolized by the names of the rest of matter.[6] Musical reasons, moreover, are added or quoted by the Persian theology; and to these, again, he strives to add a second explanation, connected also with musical considerations. But it seems to me, that to quote the language of Celsus upon these matters would be absurd, and similar to what he himself has done, when, in

[1] τῆς τε ἀπλανοῦς.

[2] κλίμαξ ὑψίπυλος. Boherellus conjectures ἑπτάπυλος.

[3] κεραστοῦ νομίσματος.

[4] τὴν χαλκοβάτην καὶ στερρὰν.

[5] τλήμονα γὰρ ἔργων ἁπάντων, καὶ χρηματιστὴν, καὶ πολύκμητον εἶναι, τόν τε σίδηρον καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν.

[6] τῆς λοιπῆς ὕλης. For ὕλης, another reading is πύλης.

his accusations against Christians and Jews, he quoted, most inappropriately, not only the words of Plato; but, dissatisfied even with these,[1] he adduced in addition the mysteries of the Persian Mithras, and the explanation of them. Now, whatever be the case with regard to these,—whether the Persians and those who conduct the mysteries of Mithras give false or true accounts regarding them,—why did he select these for quotation, rather than some of the other mysteries, with the explanation of them? For the mysteries of Mithras do not appear to be more famous among the Greeks than those of Eleusis, or than those in Egina, where individuals are initiated in the rites of Hecate. But if he must introduce barbarian mysteries with their explanation, why not rather those of the Egyptians, which are highly regarded by many,[2] or those of the Cappadocians regarding the Comanian Diana, or those of the Thracians, or even those of the Romans themselves, who initiate the noblest members of their senate?[3] But if he deemed it inappropriate to institute a comparison with any of these, because they furnished no aid in the way of accusing Jews or Christians, why did it not also appear to him inappropriate to adduce the instance of the mysteries of Mithras?

Chapter XXIII.

If one wished to obtain means for a profounder contemplation of the entrance of souls into divine things, not from the statements of that very insignificant sect from which he quoted, but from books—partly those of the Jews, which are read in their synagogues, and adopted by Christians, and partly from those of Christians alone—let him peruse, at the end of Ezekiel's prophecies, the visions beheld by the prophet, in which gates of different kinds are enumerated,[4] which obscurely refer to the different modes in which divine souls enter into a better world;[5] and let him peruse also, from the Apocalypse of John, what is related of the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and of its foundations and

[1] For ὡς ἐκείνοις ἀρκεῖσθαι, Spencer introduced into his text, οὐδ' ἐκείνοις ἀρκεῖσθαι, which has been adopted in the translation.

[2] ἐν οἷς πολλοὶ σεμνύνονται.

[3] ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς.

[4] Cf. Ezek. xlviii.

[5] ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττονα.

gates.[1] And if he is capable of finding out also the road, which is indicated by symbols, of those who will march on to divine things, let him read the book of Moses entitled Numbers, and let him seek the help of one who is capable of initiating him into the meaning of the narratives concerning the encampments of the children of Israel; viz. of what sort those were which were arranged towards the east, as was the case with the first; and what those towards the south-west and south; and what towards the sea; and what the last were, which were stationed towards the north. For he will see that there is in the respective places a meaning[2] not to be lightly treated, nor, as Celsus imagines, such as calls only for silly and servile listeners: but he will distinguish in the encampments certain things relating to the numbers that are enumerated, and which are specially adapted to each tribe, of which the present does not appear to us to be the proper time to speak. Let Celsus know, moreover, as well as those who read his book, that in no part of the genuine and divinely accredited Scriptures are "seven" heavens mentioned; neither do our prophets, nor the apostles of Jesus, nor the Son of God Himself, repeat anything which they borrowed from the Persians or the Cabiri.

Chapter xxiv.

After the instance borrowed from the Mithraic mysteries, Celsus declares that he who would investigate the Christian mysteries, along with the aforesaid Persian, will, on comparing the two together, and on unveiling the rites of the Christians, see in this way the difference between them. Now, wherever he was able to give the names of the various sects, he was nothing loth to quote those with which he thought himself acquainted; but when he ought most of all to have done this, if they were really known to him, and to have informed us which was the sect that makes use of the diagram he has drawn, he has not done so. It seems to me, however, that it is from some statements of a very insignificant sect called Ophites, which he has misunderstood, that, in my opinion, he has partly borrowed what he says about the diagram.[3] Now, as we have always been

[1] Cf. Apoc. xxi.

[2] θεωρήματα.

[3] "Utinam exstaret! Multum enim lucis procul dubio antiquissimorum

animated by a love of learning,[1] we have fallen in with this diagram, and we have found in it the representations of men who, as Paul says, "creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts; ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."[2] The diagram was, however, so destitute of all credibility, that neither these easily deceived women, nor the most rustic class of men, nor those who were ready to be led away by any plausible pretender whatever, ever gave their assent to the diagram. Nor, indeed, have we ever met any individual, although we have visited many parts of the earth, and have sought out all those who anywhere made profession of knowledge, that placed any faith in this diagram.

Chapter xxv.

In this diagram were described ten circles, distinct from each other, but united by one circle, which was said to be the soul of all things, and was called "Leviathan."[3] This Leviathan, the Jewish Scriptures say, whatever they mean by the expression, was created by God for a plaything;[4] for we find in the Psalms: "In wisdom hast Thou made all things: the earth is full of Thy creatures; so is this great and wide sea. There go the ships; small animals with great; there is this dragon, which Thou hast formed to play therein."[5] Instead of the word "dragon," the term "leviathan" is in the Hebrew. This impious diagram, then, said of this leviathan, which is so clearly depreciated by the psalmist, that it was the soul which had travelled through all things! We observed, also, in the diagram, the being named "Behemoth," placed as it were under the lowest circle. The inventor of this accursed diagram had inscribed this leviathan at its circumference and centre, thus placing its name in two separate places. Moreover, Celsus says that the diagram was "divided by a thick black line, and this line he asserted was called Gehenna, which is Tartarus." Now as we found that Gehenna was mentioned

Patrum libris, priscæ ecclesiæ temporibus, et quibusdam sacræ Scripturæ locis, accederet."—Spencer.

[1] κατὰ τὸ φιλομαθὲς ἡμῶν.
[2] Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 6, 7.
[3] Cf. note in Spencer's ed.
[4] παίγνιον.
[5] Cf. Ps. civ. 24–26.

in the Gospel as a place of punishment, we searched to see whether it is mentioned anywhere in the ancient Scriptures, and especially because the Jews too use the word. And we ascertained that where the valley of the son of Ennom was named in Scripture in the Hebrew, instead of "valley," with fundamentally the same meaning, it was termed both the valley of Ennom and also Geenna. And continuing our researches, we find that what was termed "Geenna," or "the valley of Ennom," was included in the lot of the tribe of Benjamin, in which Jerusalem also was situated. And seeking to ascertain what might be the inference from the heavenly Jerusalem belonging to the lot of Benjamin and the valley of Ennom, we find a certain confirmation of what is said regarding the place of punishment, intended for the purification of such souls as are to be purified by torments, agreeably to the saying: "The Lord cometh like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap: and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver and of gold."[1]

Chapter xxvi.

It is in the precincts of Jerusalem, then, that punishments will be inflicted upon those who undergo the process of purification,[2] who have received into the substance of their soul the elements of wickedness, which in a certain place[3] is figuratively termed "lead," and on that account iniquity is represented in Zechariah as sitting upon a "talent of lead."[4] But the remarks which might be made on this topic are neither to be made to all, nor to be uttered on the present occasion; for it is not unattended with danger to commit to writing the explanation of such subjects, seeing the multitude need no further instruction than that which relates to the punishment of sinners; while to ascend beyond this is not expedient, for the sake of those who are with difficulty restrained, even by fear of eternal punishment, from plunging into any degree of wickedness, and into the flood of evils which result from sin. The doctrine of Geenna, then, is unknown both to the Diagram and to Celsus: for had it been otherwise, the framers of the former would not have boasted of their pictures of animals and diagrams, as if the

[1] Cf. Mal. iii. 2, 3.
[2] χωνευομένων.
[3] ποῦ.
[4] Cf. Zech. v. 7.

truth were represented by these; nor would Celsus, in his treatise against the Christians, have introduced among the charges directed against them statements which they never uttered, instead of what was spoken by some who perhaps are no longer in existence, but have altogether disappeared, or been reduced to a very few individuals, and these easily counted. And as it does not beseem those who profess the doctrines of Plato to offer a defence of Epicurus and his impious opinions, so neither is it for us to defend the diagram, or to refute the accusations brought against it by Celsus. We may therefore allow his charges on these points to pass as superfluous and useless,[1] for we would censure more severely than Celsus any who should be carried away by such opinions.

Chapter xxvii.

After the matter of the Diagram, he brings forward certain monstrous statements, in the form of question and answer,[2] regarding what is called by ecclesiastical writers the "seal," statements which did not arise from imperfect information; such as that "he who impresses the seal is called father, and he who is sealed is called young man and son;" and who answers, "I have been anointed with white ointment from the tree of life,"—things which we never heard to have occurred even among the heretics. In the next place, he determines even the number mentioned by those who deliver over the seal, as that "of *seven* angels, who attach themselves to both sides of the soul of the dying body; the one party being named angels of light, the others 'archontics;'"[3] and he asserts that the "ruler of those named 'archontics' is termed the 'accursed' God." Then, laying hold of the expression, he assails, not without reason, those who venture to use such language; and on that account we entertain a similar feeling of indignation with those who censure such individuals, if indeed there exist any who call the God of the Jews—who sends rain and thunder, and who is the Creator of this world, and the God of Moses, and of the cosmogony which he records—an "accursed" divinity. Celsus, however, appears to have had in view, in employing

[1] μάτην ἐκκείμενα.
[2] ἀλλόκοτα καὶ ἀμοιβαίας φωνάς.
[3] ἀρχοντικῶν.

these expressions, not a *rational*[1] object, but one of a most irrational kind, arising out of his hatred towards us, which is so unlike a philosopher. For his aim was, that those who are unacquainted with our customs should, on perusing his treatise, at once assail us as if we called the noble Creator of this world an "accursed divinity." He appears to me, indeed, to have acted like those Jews who, when Christianity began to be first preached, scattered abroad false reports of the gospel, such as that "Christians offered up an infant in sacrifice, and partook of its flesh;" and again, "that the professors of Christianity, wishing to do the 'works of darkness,' used to extinguish the lights [in their meetings], and each one to have sexual intercourse with any woman whom he chanced to meet." These calumnies have long exercised, although unreasonably, an influence over the minds of very many, leading those who are aliens to the gospel to believe that Christians are men of such a character; and even at the present day they mislead some, and prevent them from entering even into the simple intercourse of conversation with those who are Christians.

Chapter XXVIII.

With some such object as this in view does Celsus seem to have been actuated, when he alleged that Christians term the Creator an "accursed divinity;" in order that he who believes these charges of his against us, should, if possible, arise and exterminate the Christians as the most impious of mankind. Confusing, moreover, things that are distinct,[2] he states also the reason why the God of the Mosaic cosmogony is termed "accursed," asserting that "such is his character, and worthy of execration in the opinion of those who so regard him, inasmuch as he pronounced a curse upon the serpent, who introduced the first human beings to the knowledge of good and evil." Now he ought to have known that those who have espoused the cause of the serpent, because he gave good advice to the first human beings, and who go far beyond the Titans and Giants of fable, and are on this account called Ophites, are so far from being Christians, that they bring accusations against

[1] οὐκ εὔγνωμον ἀλλά . . . πάνυ ἀγνωμονέστατον.

[2] φύρων δὲ τὰ πράγματα.

Jesus to as great a degree as Celsus himself; and they do not admit any one into their assembly[1] until he has uttered maledictions against Jesus. See, then, how irrational is the procedure of Celsus, who, in his discourse against the Christians, represents as such those who will not even listen to the *name* of Jesus, or admit even that He was a wise man, or a person of virtuous[2] character! What, then, could evince greater folly or madness, not only on the part of those who wish to derive their name from the serpent as the author of good,[3] but also on the part of Celsus, who thinks that the accusations with which the Ophites[4] are charged, are chargeable also against the Christians! Long ago, indeed, that Greek philosopher who preferred a state of poverty,[5] and who exhibited the pattern of a happy life, showing that he was not excluded from happiness although he was possessed of nothing,[6] termed himself a Cynic; while these impious wretches, as not being human beings, whose enemy the serpent is, but as being serpents, pride themselves upon being called Ophites from the serpent, which is an animal most hostile to and greatly dreaded by man, and boast of one Euphrates[7] as the introducer of these unhallowed opinions.

Chapter xxix.

In the next place, as if it were the Christians whom he was calumniating, he continues his accusations against those who termed the God of Moses and of his law an "accursed" divinity; and imagining that it is the Christians who so speak, he expresses himself thus: "What could be more foolish or insane than such senseless[8] wisdom? For what blunder has the Jewish lawgiver committed? and why do you accept, by means, as you say,[9] of a certain allegorical and typical method of interpretation, the cosmogony which he gives, and the law of the Jews, while it is with unwillingness, O most impious man, that

[1] *συνέδριον.* [2] *μέτριος τὰ ἤθη.* [3] *ἀρχηγοῦ τῶν καλῶν.*

[4] *Ὀφιᾶνοι*; cf. Irenæus, vol. i. pp. 104–112 (*Ante-Nicene Library*).

[5] *τὴν εὐτέλειαν ἀγαπήσας.*

[6] *ἀπὸ τῆς παντελοῦς ἀκτημοσύνης.*

[7] "Euphraten hujus hæresis auctorem solus Origenes tradit."—Spencer; cf. note in Spencer's ed.

[8] *ἀναισθήτου.* [9] Boherellus proposes *φῇς* for the textual reading *φησί.*

you give praise to the Creator of the world, who promised to give them all things; who promised to multiply their race to the ends of the earth, and to raise them up from the dead with the same flesh and blood, and who gave inspiration[1] to their prophets; and, again, you slander Him! When you feel the force of such considerations, indeed, you acknowledge that you worship the same God; but when your teacher Jesus and the Jewish Moses give contradictory decisions,[2] you seek another God, instead of Him, and the Father!" Now, by such statements, this illustrious philosopher Celsus distinctly slanders the Christians, asserting that, when the Jews press them hard, they acknowledge the same God as they do; but that when Jesus legislates differently from Moses, they seek another god instead of Him. Now, whether we are conversing with the Jews, or are alone with ourselves, we know of only one and the same God, whom the Jews also worshipped of old time, and still profess to worship as God, and we are guilty of no impiety towards Him. We do *not* assert, however, that God will raise men from the dead with the same flesh and blood, as has been shown in the preceding pages; for we do not maintain that the natural[3] body, which is sown in corruption, and in dishonour, and in weakness, will rise again such as it was sown. On such subjects, however, we have spoken at adequate length in the foregoing pages.

Chapter XXX.

He next returns to the subject of the Seven ruling Demons,[4] whose names are not found among Christians, but who, I think, are accepted by the Ophites. We found, indeed, that in the Diagram, which on their account we procured a sight of, the same order was laid down as that which Celsus has given. Celsus says that "the goat was shaped like a lion," not mentioning the name given him by those who are truly the most impious of individuals; whereas *we* discovered that He who is honoured in Holy Scripture as the angel of the Creator is called

[1] καὶ τοῖς προφήταις ἐμπνέοντα.

[2] ὅταν δὲ τὰ ἐναντία ὁ σὸς διδάσκαλος Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ὁ Ἰουδαίων Μωϋσῆς, νομοθετῇ.

[3] ψυχικόν.

[4] Cf. Spencer's note, as quoted in Benedictine ed.

by this accursed Diagram Michael the Lion-like. Again, Celsus says that the "second in order is a bull;" whereas the Diagram which we possessed made him to be Suriel, the bull-like. Further, Celsus termed the third "an amphibious sort of animal, and one that hissed frightfully;" while the Diagram described the third as Raphael, the serpent-like. Moreover, Celsus asserted that the "fourth had the form of an eagle;" the Diagram representing him as Gabriel, the eagle-like. Again, the "fifth," according to Celsus, "had the countenance of a bear;" and this, according to the Diagram, was Thauthabaoth,[1] the bear-like. Celsus continues his account, that the "sixth was described as having the face of a dog;" and him the Diagram called Erataoth. The "seventh," he adds, "had the countenance of an ass, and was named Thaphabaoth or Onoel;" whereas we discovered that in the Diagram he is called Onoel, or Thartharaoth, being somewhat asinine in appearance. We have thought it proper to be exact in stating these matters, that we might not appear to be ignorant of those things which Celsus professed to know, but that we Christians, knowing them better than he, may demonstrate that these are not the words of Christians, but of those who are altogether alienated from salvation, and who neither acknowledge Jesus as Saviour, nor God, nor teacher, nor Son of God.

Chapter xxxi.

Moreover, if any one would wish to become acquainted with the artifices of those sorcerers, through which they desire to lead men away by their teaching (as if they possessed the knowledge of certain secret rites), but are not at all successful in so doing, let him listen to the instruction which they receive after passing through what is termed the "fence of wickedness,"[2]—gates which are subjected to the world of ruling spirits.[3] [The following, then, is the manner in which they proceed]: "I

[1] "Nescio, an hæresium Scriptores hujus Thauthabaoth, Erataoth, Thaphabaoth, Onoeles, et Thartharaoth, usquam meminerint. Hujus generis vocabula innumera invenies apud Epiphan. *Hær.* 31, quæ est Valentinianorum, pp. 165–171."—Spencer.

[2] *Φραγμὸν κακίας.*

[3] *πύλας ἀρχόντων αἰῶνι δεδεμένας.*

salute the one-formed[1] king, the bond of blindness, complete[2] oblivion, the first power, preserved by the spirit of providence and by wisdom, from whom I am sent forth pure, being already part of the light of the son and of the father: grace be with me; yea, O father, let it be with me." They say also that the beginnings of the Ogdoad[3] are derived from this. In the next place, they are taught to say as follows, while passing through what they call Ialdabaoth: "Thou, O first and seventh, who art born to command with confidence, thou, O Ialdabaoth, who art the rational ruler of a pure mind, and a perfect work to son and father, bearing the symbol of life in the character of a type, and opening to the world the gate which thou didst close against thy kingdom, I pass again in freedom through thy realm. Let grace be with me; yea, O father, let it be with me." They say, moreover, that the star Phænon[4] is in sympathy[5] with the lion-like ruler. They next imagine that he who has passed through Ialdabaoth and arrived at Iao ought thus to speak: "Thou, O second Iao, who shinest by night,[6] who art the ruler of the secret mysteries of son and father, first prince of death, and portion of the innocent, bearing now mine own beard as symbol, I am ready to pass through thy realm, having strengthened him who is born of thee by the living word. Grace be with me; father, let it be with me." They next come to Sabaoth, to whom they think the following should be addressed: "O governor of the fifth realm, powerful Sabaoth, defender of the law of thy creatures, who are liberated by thy grace through the help of a more powerful Pentad,[7] admit me, seeing the faultless symbol of their art, preserved by the stamp of an image, a body liberated by a Pentad. Let grace be with me, O father, let grace be with me." And after Sabaoth they come to Astaphæus, to whom they believe the following prayer should be offered: "O Astaphæus, ruler of the third gate,

[1] μονότροπον. [2] λήθην ἀπερίσκεπτον.

[3] Ὀγδοάδος. Cf. Tertullian, *de præscript. adv. Hæreticos*, c. 33 (*Ante-Nicene Library;* Writings of Tertullian, vol. ii. p. 39), and other references in Benedictine ed.

[4] Φαίνων. "Ea, quæ Saturni stella dicitur, Φαίνων a Græcis dicitur."—Cicero, *de Nat. Deorum*, book ii.

[5] συμπαθεῖν. [6] νυκτοφαής. [7] πεντάδι δυνατωτέρᾳ.

overseer of the first principle of water, look upon me as one of thine initiated,[1] admit me who am purified with the spirit of a virgin, thou who seest the essence of the world. Let grace be with me, O father, let grace be with me." After him comes Aloæus, who is to be thus addressed: "O Aloæus, governor of the second gate, let me pass, seeing I bring to thee the symbol of thy mother, a grace which is hidden by the powers of the realms.[2] Let grace be with me, O father, let it be with me." And last of all they name Horæus, and think that the following prayer ought to be offered to him: "Thou who didst fearlessly overleap the rampart of fire, O Horæus, who didst obtain the government of the first gate, let me pass, seeing thou beholdest the symbol of thine own power, sculptured[3] on the figure of the tree of life, and formed after this image, in the likeness of innocence. Let grace be with me, O father, let grace be with me."

Chapter xxxii.

The supposed great learning of Celsus, which is composed, however, rather of curious trifles and silly talk than anything else, has made us touch upon these topics, from a wish to show to every one who peruses his treatise and our reply, that we have no lack of information on those subjects, from which he takes occasion to calumniate the Christians, who neither are acquainted with, nor concern themselves about, such matters. For we, too, desired both to learn and set forth these things, in order that sorcerers might not, under pretext of knowing more than we, delude those who are easily carried away by the glitter[4] of names. And I could have given many more illustrations to show that we are acquainted with the opinions of these deluders,[5] and that we disown them, as being alien to ours, and impious, and not in harmony with the doctrines of true Christians, of which we are ready to make confession even to the death. It must be noticed, too, that those who have drawn up this array of fictions, have, from neither understanding magic,

[1] μύστην. [2] χάριν κρυπτομένην δυνάμεσιν ἐξουσιῶν.

[3] For καταλυθέν Boherellus conjectures καταγλυφθέν, which has been adopted in the translation.

[4] φαντασίας. [5] ἀπατεώνων.

nor discriminating the meaning of Holy Scripture, thrown everything into confusion; seeing that they have borrowed from magic the names of Ialdabaoth, and Astaphæus, and Horæus, and from the Hebrew Scriptures him who is termed in Hebrew Iao or Jah, and Sabaoth, and Adonæus, and Eloæus. Now the names taken from the Scriptures are names of one and the same God; which, not being understood by the enemies of God, as even themselves acknowledge, led to their imagining that Iao was a different God, and Sabaoth another, and Adonæus, whom the Scriptures term Adonai, a third besides, and that Eloæus, whom the prophets name in Hebrew Eloi, was also different.

Chapter xxxiii.

Celsus next relates other fables, to the effect that "certain persons return to the shapes of the archontics,[1] so that some are called lions, others bulls, others dragons, or eagles, or bears, or dogs." We found also in the Diagram which we possessed, and which Celsus called the "square pattern," the statements[2] made by these unhappy beings concerning the gates of Paradise. The flaming sword was depicted as the diameter of a flaming circle, and as if mounting guard over the tree of knowledge and of life. Celsus, however, either would not or could not repeat the harangues which, according to the fables of these impious individuals, are represented as spoken at each of the gates by those who pass through them; but this we have done in order to show to Celsus and those who read his treatise, that we know the depth of these unhallowed mysteries,[3] and that they are far removed from the worship which Christians offer up to God.

Chapter xxxiv.

After finishing the foregoing, and those analogous matters which we ourselves have added, Celsus continues as follows: "They continue to heap together one thing after another,—discourses of prophets, and circles upon circles, and effluents[4]

[1] εἰς τὰς ἀρχοντικὰς μορφάς.

[2] Guietus thinks that some word has been omitted here, as ξίφος, which seems very probable.

[3] τὸ τῆς ἀτελέστου τελετῆς πέρας.

[4] ἀπορρροίας.

from an earthly church, and from circumcision; and a power flowing from one Prunicos, a virgin and a living soul; and a heaven slain in order to live, and an earth slaughtered by the sword, and many put to death that they may live, and death ceasing in the world, when the sin of the world is dead; and, again, a narrow way, and gates that open spontaneously. And in all their writings [is mention made] of the tree of life, and a resurrection of the flesh by means[1] of the 'tree,' because, I imagine, their teacher was nailed to a cross, and was a carpenter by trade; so that if he had chanced to have been cast from a precipice, or thrust into a pit, or suffocated by hanging, or had been a leather-cutter, or stone-cutter, or worker in iron, there would have been [invented] a precipice of life beyond the heavens, or a pit of resurrection, or a cord of immortality, or a blessed stone, or an iron of love, or a sacred leather! Now what old woman would not be ashamed to utter such things in a whisper, even when making stories to lull an infant to sleep?" In using such language as this, Celsus appears to me to confuse together matters which he has imperfectly heard. For it seems likely that, even supposing that he had heard a few words traceable to some existing heresy, he did not clearly understand the meaning intended to be conveyed; but heaping the words together, he wished to show before those who knew nothing either of our opinions or of those of the heretics, that he was acquainted with all the doctrines of the Christians. And this is evident also from the foregoing words.

Chapter xxxv.

It is our practice, indeed, to make use of the words of the prophets, who demonstrate that Jesus is the Christ predicted by them, and who show from the prophetic writings that the events in the Gospels regarding Jesus have been fulfilled. But when Celsus speaks of "circles upon circles," [he perhaps borrowed the expression] from the aforementioned heresy, which includes in one circle (which they call the soul of all things, and Leviathan) the seven circles of archontic demons, or perhaps it arises from misunderstanding the preacher, when he says: "The wind goeth in a circle of circles, and returneth again

[1] ἀπὸ ξύλου.

upon its circles."[1] The expression, too, "effluents of an earthly church and of circumcision," was probably taken from the fact that the church on earth was called by some an effluent from a heavenly church and a better world; and that the circumcision described in the law was a symbol of the circumcision performed there, in a certain place set apart for purification. The adherents of Valentinus, moreover, in keeping with their system of error,[2] give the name of Prunicos to a certain kind of wisdom, of which they would have the woman afflicted with the twelve years' issue of blood to be the symbol; so that Celsus, who confuses together all sorts of opinions—Greek, Barbarian, and Heretical—having heard of her, asserted that it was a power flowing forth from one Prunicos, a virgin. The "living soul," again, is perhaps mysteriously referred by some of the followers of Valentinus to the being whom they term the psychic[3] creator of the world; or perhaps, in contradistinction to a "dead" soul, the "living" soul is termed by some, not inelegantly,[4] the soul of "him who is saved." I know nothing, however, of a "heaven which is said to be slain," or of an "earth slaughtered by the sword," or of many persons slain in order that they might live; for it is not unlikely that these were coined by Celsus out of his own brain.

Chapter xxxvi.

We would say, moreover, that death ceases in the world when the sin of the world dies, referring the saying to the mystical words of the apostle, which run as follows: "When He shall have put all enemies under His feet, then the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."[5] And also: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."[6] The "strait descent,"[7] again, may perhaps be referred by those who hold the doctrine of transmigration of souls to that view of things. And it is not incredible that the gates which are said

[1] Eccles. i. 6 (literally rendered).
[2] κατὰ τὴν πεπλανημένην ἑαυτῶν σοφίαν.
[3] ψυχικὸν δημιουργόν.
[4] οὐκ ἀγεννῶς.
[5] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.
[6] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 54; cf. Hos. xiii. 14.
[7] κάθοδον στενήν.

to open spontaneously are referred obscurely by some to the words, "Open to me the gates of righteousness, that I may go into them, and praise the Lord; this gate of the Lord, into it the righteous shall enter;"[1] and again, to what is said in the ninth psalm, "Thou that liftest me up from the gates of death, that I may show forth all Thy praise in the gates of the daughter of Zion."[2] The Scripture further gives the name of "gates of death" to those sins which lead to destruction, as it terms, on the contrary, good actions the "gates of Zion." So also "the gates of righteousness," which is an equivalent expression to "the gates of virtue," and these are ready to be opened to him who follows after virtuous pursuits. The subject of the "tree of life" will be more appropriately explained when we interpret the statements in the book of Genesis regarding the paradise planted by God. Celsus, moreover, has often mocked at the subject of a resurrection,—a doctrine which he did not comprehend; and on the present occasion, not satisfied with what he has formerly said, he adds, "And there is said to be a resurrection of the flesh by means of the tree;" not understanding, I think, the symbolical expression, that "through the tree came death, and through the tree comes life,"[3] because death was in Adam, and life in Christ. He next scoffs at the "tree," assailing it on two grounds, and saying, "For this reason is the tree introduced, either because our teacher was nailed to a cross, or because he was a carpenter by trade;" not observing that the tree of life is mentioned in the Mosaic writings, and being blind also to this, that in none of the Gospels current in the churches is Jesus Himself ever described as being a carpenter.[4]

Chapter xxxvii.

Celsus, moreover, thinks that we have invented this "tree of life" to give an allegorical meaning to the cross; and in consequence of his error upon this point, he adds: "If he had happened to be cast down a precipice, or shoved into a pit, or suffocated by hanging, there would have been invented a precipice of life far beyond the heavens, or a pit of resurrection, or

[1] Cf. Ps. cxviii. 19, 20.
[2] Cf. Ps. ix. 13, 14.
[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22.
[4] Cf., however, Mark vi. 3.

a cord of immortality." And again: "If the 'tree of life' were an invention, because he (Jesus) [is reported] to have been a carpenter, it would follow that if he had been a leather-cutter, something would have been said about holy leather; or had he been a stone-cutter, about a blessed stone; or if a worker in iron, about an iron of love." Now, who does not see at once[1] the paltry nature of his charge, in thus calumniating men whom he professed to convert on the ground of their being deceived? And after these remarks, he goes on to speak in a way quite in harmony with the tone of those who have invented the fictions of lion-like, and ass-headed, and serpent-like ruling angels,[2] and other similar absurdities, but which does not affect those who belong to the church. Of a truth, even a drunken old woman would be ashamed to chaunt or whisper to an infant, in order to lull him to sleep, any such fables as those have done who invented the beings with asses' heads, and the harangues, so to speak, which are delivered at each of the gates. But Celsus is not acquainted with the doctrines of the members of the church, which very few have been able to comprehend, even of those who have devoted all their lives, in conformity with the command of Jesus, to the searching of the Scriptures, and have laboured to investigate the meaning of the sacred books, to a greater degree than Greek philosophers in their efforts to attain a so-called wisdom.

Chapter xxxviii.

Our noble [friend], moreover, not satisfied with the objections which he has drawn from the Diagram, desires, in order to strengthen his accusations against us, who have nothing in common with it, to introduce certain other charges, which he adduces from the same [heretics], but yet as if they were from a different source. His words are: "And that is not the least of their marvels, for there are between the upper circles—those that are above the heavens—certain inscriptions of which they give the interpretation, and among others two words especially, 'a greater and a less,' which they refer to Father and Son."[3] Now, in the Diagram referred to, we found the greater and

[1] αὐτόθεν. [2] ἄρχοντας.

[3] ἄλλα τε, καὶ δύο ἄττα, μεῖζον τε καὶ μικρότερον υἱοῦ καὶ πατρός.

the lesser circle, upon the diameter of which was inscribed "Father and Son;" and between the greater circle (in which the lesser was contained) and another [1] composed of two circles, —the outer one of which was yellow, and the inner blue,—a barrier inscribed in the shape of a hatchet. And above it, a short circle, close to the greater of the two former, having the inscription "Love;" and lower down, one touching the same circle, with the word "Life." And on the second circle, which was intertwined with and included two other circles, another figure, like a rhomboid, [entitled] "The foresight of wisdom." And within their point of common section was "The nature of wisdom." And above their point of common section was a circle, on which was inscribed "Knowledge;" and lower down another, on which was the inscription, "Understanding." We have introduced these matters into our reply to Celsus, to show to our readers that we know better than he, and not by mere report, those things, even although we also disapprove of them. Moreover, if those who pride themselves upon such matters profess also a kind of magic and sorcery,—which, in their opinion, is the summit of wisdom,—we, on the other hand, make no affirmation about it, seeing we never have discovered anything of the kind. Let Celsus, however, who has been already often convicted of false witness and irrational accusations, see whether he is not guilty of falsehood in these also, or whether he has not extracted and introduced into his treatise, statements taken from the writings of those who are foreigners and strangers to our Christian faith.

Chapter XXXIX.

In the next place, speaking of those who employ the arts of magic and sorcery, and who invoke the barbarous names of demons, he remarks that such persons act like those who, in reference to the same things,[2] perform marvels before those who are ignorant that the names of demons among the Greeks are different from what they are among the Scythians. He

[1] For ἄλλους, the textual reading, Gelenius, with the approval of Boherellus, proposes καὶ ἄλλου συγκειμένου, which has been followed in the translation.

[2] ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὑποκειμένοις.

then quotes a passage from Herodotus, stating that "Apollo is called Gongosyrus by the Scythians; Poseidon, Thagimasada; Aphrodite, Argimpasan; Hestia, Tabiti."[1] Now, he who has the capacity can inquire whether in these matters Celsus and Herodotus are not both wrong; for the Scythians do not understand the same thing as the Greeks, in what relates to those beings which are deemed to be gods. For how is it credible[2] that Apollo should be called Gongosyrus by the Scythians? I do not suppose that Gongosyrus, when transferred into the Greek language, yields the same etymology as Apollo; or that Apollo, in the dialect of the Scythians, has the signification of Gongosyrus. Nor has any such assertion hitherto been made regarding the other names,[3] for the Greeks took occasion from different circumstances and etymologies to give to those who are by them deemed gods the names which they bear; and the Scythians, again, from another set of circumstances; and the same also was the case with the Persians, or Indians, or Ethiopians, or Libyans, or with those who delight to bestow names [from fancy], and who do not abide by the just and pure idea of the Creator of all things. Enough, however, has been said by us in the preceding pages, where we wished to demonstrate that Sabaoth and Zeus were not the same deity, and where also we made some remarks, derived from the Holy Scriptures, regarding the different dialects. We willingly, then, pass by these points, on which Celsus would make us repeat ourselves. In the next place, again, mixing up together matters which belong to magic and sorcery, and referring them perhaps to no one,—because of the non-existence of any who practise magic under pretence of a worship of this character,—and yet, perhaps, having in view some who *do* employ such practices in the presence of the simple (that they may have the appearance of acting by divine power), he adds: "What need to number up all those who have taught methods of purification, or expiatory hymns, or spells for averting evil, or [the making of] images, or resemblances of demons, or the

[1] Cf. Herodot. iv. 9.

[2] *ποία γὰρ πιθανότης.*

[3] For the textual reading, *οὔπω δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ταὐτόν τι ἐρεῖ*, Boherellus conjectures *εἴρηται*, which has been adopted in the translation.

various sorts of antidotes against poison [to be found][1] in clothes, or in numbers, or stones, or plants, or roots, or generally in all kinds of things?" In respect to these matters, reason does not require us to offer any defence, since we are not liable in the slightest degree to suspicions of such a nature.

Chapter xl.

After these things, Celsus appears to me to act like those who, in their intense hatred of the Christians, maintain, in the presence of those who are utterly ignorant of the Christian faith, that they have actually ascertained that Christians devour the flesh of infants, and give themselves without restraint to sexual intercourse with their women. Now, as these statements have been condemned as falsehoods invented against the Christians, and this admission made by the multitude and those altogether aliens to our faith; so would the following statements of Celsus be found to be calumnies invented against the Christians, where he says that "he has seen in the hands of certain presbyters belonging to our faith[2] barbarous books, containing the names and marvellous doings of demons;" asserting further, that "these presbyters of our faith professed to do no good, but all that was calculated to injure human beings." Would, indeed, that all that is said by Celsus against the Christians was of such a nature as to be refuted by the multitude, who have ascertained by experience that such things are untrue, seeing that most of them have lived as neighbours with the Christians, and have not even heard of the existence of any such alleged practices!

Chapter xli.

In the next place, as if he had forgotten that it was his object to write against the Christians, he says that, "having become acquainted with one Dionysius, an Egyptian musician, the latter told him, with respect to magic arts, that it was only over the uneducated and men of corrupt morals that they had any power, while on philosophers they were unable to produce

[1] For *αἰσθητῶν*, Lommatzsch adopts the conjecture of Boherellus, approved by Ruæus, *ἐσθήτων*.

[2] *δόξης*.

any effect, because they were careful to observe a healthy manner of life." If, now, it had been our purpose to treat of magic, we could have added a few remarks in addition to what we have already said on this topic; but since it is only the more important matters which we have to notice in answer to Celsus, we shall say of magic, that any one who chooses to inquire whether philosophers were ever led captive by it or not, can read what has been written by Moiragenes regarding the memoirs of the magician and philosopher Apollonius of Tyana, in which this individual, who is not a Christian, but a philosopher, asserts that some philosophers of no mean note were won over by the magic power possessed by Apollonius, and resorted to him as a sorcerer; and among these, I think, he especially mentioned Euphrates and a certain Epicurean. Now *we*, on the other hand, affirm, and have learned by experience, that they who worship the God of all things in conformity with the Christianity which comes by Jesus, and who live according to His gospel, using night and day, continuously and becomingly, the prescribed prayers, are not carried away either by magic or demons. For verily "the angel of the Lord encamps round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them"[1] from all evil; and the angels of the little ones in the church, who are appointed to watch over them, are said always to behold the face of their Father who is in heaven,[2] whatever be the meaning of "face" or of "behold."

Chapter xlii.

After these matters, Celsus brings the following charges against us from another quarter: "Certain most impious errors," he says, "are committed by them, due to their extreme ignorance, in which they have wandered away from the meaning of the divine enigmas, creating an adversary to God, the devil, and naming him in the Hebrew tongue, Satan. Now, of a truth, such statements are altogether of mortal invention,[3] and not even proper to be repeated, viz. that the mighty God, in His desire to confer good upon men, has yet one counterwork-

[1] Cf. Ps. xxxiv. 7.

[2] Cf. Matt. xviii. 10.

[3] *θνητά*. Instead of this reading, Guietus conjectures *πτηκτά*, which is approved of by Ruæus.

ing Him, and is helpless. The Son of God, it follows, is vanquished by the devil; and being punished by him, teaches us also to despise the punishments which he inflicts, telling us beforehand that Satan, after appearing to men as He Himself had done, will exhibit great and marvellous works, claiming for himself the glory of God, but that those who wish to keep him at a distance ought to pay no attention to these works of Satan, but to place their faith in Him alone. Such statements are manifestly the words of a deluder, planning and manœuvring against those who are opposed to his views, and who rank themselves against them." In the next place, desiring to point out the "enigmas," our mistakes regarding which lead to the introduction of our views concerning Satan, he continues: "The ancients allude obscurely to a certain war among the gods, Heraclitus speaking thus of it: 'If one must say that there is a general war and discord, and that all things are done and administered in strife.' Pherecydes, again, who is much older than Heraclitus, relates a myth of one army drawn up in hostile array against another, and names Kronos as the leader of the one, and Ophioneus of the other, and recounts their challenges and struggles, and mentions that agreements were entered into between them, to the end that whichever party should fall into the Ocean[1] should be held as vanquished, while those who had expelled and conquered them should have possession of heaven. The mysteries relating to the Titans and Giants also had some such [symbolical] meaning, as well as the Egyptian mysteries of Typhon, and Horus, and Osiris." After having made such statements, and not having got over the difficulty[2] as to the way in which these accounts contain a higher view of things, while our accounts are erroneous copies of them, he continues his abuse of us, remarking that "these are not like the stories which are related of a devil, or demon, or, as he remarks with more truth, of a man who is an impostor, who wishes to establish an opposite doctrine." And in the same way he understands Homer, as if he referred obscurely to matters similar to those mentioned by Heraclitus, and Pherecydes, and the originators of the mysteries about the Titans

[1] Ὠγηνόν, *i.e.* in Oceanum, Hesych.; Ὠγην, ὠκεανός, Suid.

[2] καὶ μὴ παραμυθησάμενος.

and Giants, in those words which Hephæstus addresses to Hera, as follows:

> "Once in your cause I felt his matchless might,
> Hurled headlong downward from the ethereal height."[1]

And in those of Zeus to Hera:

> "Hast thou forgot, when bound and fix'd on high
> From the vast concave of the spangled sky,
> I hung thee trembling on a golden chain,
> And all the raging gods opposed in vain?
> Headlong I hurled them from the Olympian hall,
> Stunn'd in the whirl, and breathless with the fall."[2]

Interpreting, moreover, the words of Homer, he adds: "The words of Zeus addressed to Hera are the words of God addressed to matter; and the words addressed to matter obscurely signify that the matter which at the beginning was in a state of discord [with God], was taken by Him, and bound together and arranged under laws, which may be analogically compared to chains;[3] and that by way of chastising the demons who create disorder in it, he hurls them down headlong to this lower world." These words of Homer, he alleges, were so understood by Pherecydes, when he said that beneath that region is the region of Tartarus, which is guarded by the Harpies and Tempest, daughters of Boreas, and to which Zeus banishes any one of the gods who becomes disorderly. With the same ideas also are closely connected the *peplos* of Athena, which is beheld by all in the procession of the *Panathenæa*. For it is manifest from this, he continues, that a motherless and unsullied demon[4] has the mastery over the daring of the Giants. While accepting, moreover, the fictions of the Greeks, he continues to heap against us such accusations as the following, viz., that "the Son of God is punished by the devil, and teaches us that we also, when punished by him, ought to endure it. Now these statements are altogether ridiculous. For it is the devil, I think, who ought rather to be punished, and those human beings who are calumniated by him ought not to be threatened with chastisement."

[1] Cf. *Iliad*, book i. v. 590, Pope's translation.
[2] Cf. *Iliad*, book xv. vv. 18–24, Pope's translation.
[3] ἀναλογίαις τισὶ συνέδησε καὶ ἐκόσμησεν ὁ Θεός.
[4] ἀμήτωρ τις καὶ ἄχραντος δαίμων.

Chapter xliii.

Mark now, whether he who charges us with having committed errors of the most impious kind, and with having wandered away from the [true meaning] of the divine enigmas, is not himself clearly in error, from not observing that in the writings of Moses, which are much older not merely than Heraclitus and Pherecydes, but even than Homer, mention is made of this wicked one, and of his having fallen from heaven. For the serpent[1]—from whom the Ophioneus spoken of by Pherecydes is derived—having become the cause of man's expulsion from the divine Paradise, obscurely shadows forth something similar, having deceived the woman[2] by a promise of divinity and of greater blessings; and her example is said to have been followed also by the man. And, further, who else could the destroying angel mentioned in the Exodus of Moses[3] be, than he who was the author of destruction to them that obeyed him, and did not withstand his wicked deeds, nor struggle against them? Moreover, [the goat], which in the book of Leviticus[4] is sent away [into the wilderness], and which in the Hebrew language is named Azazel, was none other than this; and it was necessary to send it away into the desert, and to treat it as an expiatory sacrifice, because on it the lot fell. For all who belong to the "worse" part, on account of their wickedness, being opposed to those who are God's heritage, are deserted by God. Nay, with respect to the sons of Belial in the book of Judges,[5] whose sons are they said to be, save his, on account of their wickedness? And besides all these instances, in the book of Job, which is older even than Moses himself, the devil is distinctly described as presenting himself before God,[6] and asking for power against Job, that he might involve him in trials[7] of the most painful kind; the first of which consisted in the loss of all his goods and of his children, and the second in afflicting the whole body of Job with the so-called disease of elephantiasis.[8] I pass by

[1] Cf. Gen. iii.
[2] *τὸ θηλύτερον γένος.*
[3] Cf. Ex. xii. 23.
[4] Cf. Lev. xvi. 8.
[5] *ἐναντίοι ὄντες τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήρου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔρημοί εἰσι Θεοῦ.*
[6] Cf. Job i., ii.
[7] *περιστάσεσι.*
[8] *ἀγρίῳ ἐλέφαντι.*

what might be quoted from the Gospels regarding the devil who tempted the Saviour, that I may not appear to quote in reply to Celsus from more recent writings on this question. In the last [chapter][1] also of Job, in which the Lord utters to Job amid tempest and clouds what is recorded in the book which bears his name, there are not a few things referring to the serpent. I have not yet mentioned the passages in Ezekiel,[2] where he speaks, as it were, of Pharaoh, or Nebuchadnezzar, or the prince of Tyre; or those in Isaiah,[3] where lament is made for the king of Babylon, from which not a little might be learned concerning evil, as to the nature of its origin and generation, and as to how it derived its existence from some who had lost their wings,[4] and who had followed him who was the first to lose his own.

Chapter xliv.

For it is impossible that the good which is the result of accident, or of communication, should be like that good which comes by nature; and yet the former will never be lost by him who, so to speak, partakes of the "living" bread with a view to his own preservation. But if it should fail any one, it must be through his own fault, in being slothful to partake of this "living bread" and "genuine drink," by means of which the wings, nourished and watered, are fitted for their purpose, even according to the saying of Solomon, the wisest of men, concerning the truly rich man, that "he made to himself wings like an eagle, and returns to the house of his patron."[5] For it became God, who knows how to turn to proper account even those who in their wickedness have apostatized from Him, to place wickedness of this sort in some part of the universe, and to appoint a training-school of virtue, wherein those must exercise themselves who would desire to recover in a "lawful manner"[6] the possession [which they had lost]; in order that being tested, like gold in the fire, by the wickedness of these, and having exerted themselves to the utmost to prevent anything base injuring their rational nature, they may appear

[1] Cf. Job xl. 20.
[2] Cf. Ezek. xxxii. 1–28.
[3] Isa. xiv. 4 sqq.
[4] πτερορρυησάντων. Cf. Book iv. c. 40.
[5] Cf. Prov. xxiii. 5.
[6] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 5.

deserving of an ascent to divine things, and may be elevated by the Word to the blessedness which is above all things, and so to speak, to the very summit of goodness. Now he who in the Hebrew language is named Satan, and by some Satanas—as being more in conformity with the genius of the Greek language—signifies, when translated into Greek, "adversary." But every one who prefers vice and a vicious life, is (because acting in a manner contrary to virtue) Satanas, that is, an "adversary" to the Son of God, who is righteousness, and truth, and wisdom.[1] With more propriety, however, is *he* called "adversary," who was the first among those that were living a peaceful and happy life to lose his wings, and to fall from blessedness; he who, according to Ezekiel, walked faultlessly in all his ways, "until iniquity was found in him,"[2] and who being the "seal of resemblance" and the "crown of beauty" in the paradise of God, being filled as it were with good things, fell into destruction, in accordance with the word which said to him in a mystic sense: "Thou hast fallen into destruction, and shalt not abide for ever."[3] We have ventured somewhat rashly to make these few remarks, although in so doing we have added nothing of importance to this treatise. If any one, however, who has leisure for the examination of the sacred writings, should collect together from all sources and form into one body of doctrine what is recorded concerning the origin of evil, and the manner of its dissolution, he would see that the views of Moses and the prophets regarding Satan had not been even dreamed of either by Celsus or any one of those whose soul had been dragged down, and torn away from God, and from right views of Him, and from His word, by this wicked demon.

Chapter xlv.

But since Celsus rejects the statements concerning Antichrist, as it is termed, having neither read what is said of him in the book of Daniel[4] nor in the writings of Paul,[5] nor what the Saviour in the Gospels[6] has predicted about his coming, we must make a few remarks upon this subject also; because, "as

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 30. [2] Cf. Ezek. xxviii. 15. [3] Cf. Ezek. xxviii. 19.
[4] Cf. Dan. viii. 23. [5] Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. [6] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 4.

faces do not resemble faces,"[1] so also neither do men's "hearts" resemble one another. It is certain, then, that there will be diversities amongst the hearts of men,—those which are inclined to virtue not being all modelled and shaped towards it in the same or like degree; while others, through neglect of virtue, rush to the opposite extreme. And amongst the latter are some in whom evil is deeply engrained, and others in whom it is less deeply rooted. Where is the absurdity, then, in holding that there exist among men, so to speak, two extremes,[2]—the one of virtue, and the other of its opposite; so that the perfection of virtue dwells in the man who realizes the ideal given in Jesus, from whom there flowed to the human race so great a conversion, and healing, and amelioration, while the opposite extreme is in the man who embodies the notion of him that is named Antichrist? For God, comprehending all things by means of His foreknowledge, and foreseeing what consequences would result from both of these, wished to make these known to mankind by His prophets, that those who understand their words might be familiarized with the good, and be on their guard against its opposite. It was proper, moreover, that the one of these extremes, and the best of the two, should be styled the Son of God, on account of His pre-eminence; and the other, who is diametrically opposite, be termed the son of the wicked demon, and of Satan, and of the devil. And, in the next place, since evil is specially characterized by its diffusion, and attains its greatest height when it simulates the appearance of the good, for that reason are signs, and marvels, and lying miracles found to accompany evil, through the co-operation of its father the devil. For, far surpassing the help which these demons give to jugglers (who deceive men for the basest of purposes), is the aid which the devil himself affords in order to deceive the human race. Paul, indeed, speaks of him who is called Antichrist, describing, though with a certain reserve,[3] both the manner, and time, and cause of his coming to the human race. And notice whether his language on this subject is not most becoming, and undeserving of being treated with even the slightest degree of ridicule.

[1] Cf. Prov. xxvii. 19.

[2] ἀκρότητας.

[3] μετά τινος ἐπικρύψεως. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 9.

Chapter xlvi.

It is thus that the apostle expresses himself: "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by word, nor by spirit, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of the Lord is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only He who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming: *even him*, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."[1] To explain each particular here referred to does not belong to our present purpose. The prophecy also regarding Antichrist is stated in the book of Daniel, and is fitted to make an intelligent and candid reader admire the words as truly divine and prophetic; for in them are mentioned the things relating to the coming kingdom, beginning with the times of Daniel, and continuing to the destruction of the world. And any one who chooses may read it. Observe, however, whether the prophecy regarding Antichrist be not as follows: "And at the latter time of their kingdom, when their sins are coming to the full, there shall arise a king, bold in countenance, and understanding riddles. And his power shall be great, and he shall destroy wonderfully, and

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 1–12.

prosper, and practise; and shall destroy mighty men, and the holy people. And the yoke of his chain shall prosper: there is craft in his hand, and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by craft shall destroy many; and he shall stand up for the destruction of many, and shall crush them as eggs in his hand."[1] What is stated by Paul in the words quoted from him, where he says, "so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God,"[2] is in Daniel referred to in the following fashion: "And on the temple shall be the abomination of desolations, and at the end of the time an end shall be put to the desolation."[3] So many, out of a greater number of passages, have I thought it right to adduce, that the hearer may understand in some slight degree the meaning of Holy Scripture, when it gives us information concerning the devil and Antichrist; and being satisfied with what we have quoted for this purpose, let us look at another of the charges of Celsus, and reply to it as we best may.

Chapter xlvii.

Celsus, after what has been said, goes on as follows: "I can tell how the very thing occurred, viz. that they should call him 'Son of God.' Men of ancient times termed this world, as being born of God, both his child and his son.[4] Both the one and other 'Son of God,' then, greatly resembled each other." He is therefore of opinion that we employed the expression "Son of God," having perverted[5] what is said of the world, as being born of God, and being His "Son," and "a God." For he was unable so to consider the times of Moses and the prophets, as to see that the Jewish prophets predicted generally that there was a "Son of God" long before the Greeks and those men of ancient time of whom Celsus speaks. Nay, he would not even quote the passage in the letters of Plato, to which we referred in the preceding pages, concerning Him who so beautifully arranged this world, as being the Son of God; lest he too should be compelled by Plato, whom he often mentions with respect, to admit that the architect of this world *is* the Son of God, and that His Father is the first God and Sove-

[1] Cf. Dan. viii. 23–25 (LXX.). [2] Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 4. [3] Cf. Dan. ix. 27.
[4] παῖδά τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡίθεον. [5] παραποιήσαντας.

reign Ruler over all things. Nor is it at all wonderful if we maintain that the soul of Jesus is made one with so great a Son of God through the highest union with Him, being no longer in a state of separation from Him. For the sacred language of Holy Scripture knows of other things also, which, although "dual" in their own nature, are considered to be, and really are, "one" in respect to one another. It is said of husband and wife, "They are no longer twain, but one flesh;"[1] and of the perfect man, and of him who is joined to the true Lord, Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, that "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit."[2] And if he who "is joined to the Lord is one spirit," who has been joined to the Lord, the Very Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, in a more intimate union, or even in a manner at all approaching to it than the soul of Jesus? And if this be so, then the soul of Jesus and God the Word—the first-born of every creature—are no longer two, [but one].

Chapter xlviii.

In the next place, when the philosophers of the Porch, who assert that the virtue of God and man is the same, maintain that the God who is over all things is not happier than *their* wise man, but that the happiness of both is equal, Celsus neither ridicules nor scoffs at their opinion. If, however, Holy Scripture says that the perfect man is joined to and made one with the Very Word by means of virtue, so that we infer that the soul of Jesus is not separated from the first-born of all creation, he laughs at Jesus being called "Son of God," not observing what is said of Him with a secret and mystical signification in the Holy Scriptures. But that we may win over to the reception of our views those who are willing to accept the inferences which flow from our doctrines, and to be benefited thereby, we say that the Holy Scriptures declare the body of Christ, animated by the Son of God, to be the whole church of God, and the members of this body—considered as a whole—to consist of those who are believers; since, as a soul vivifies and moves the body, which of itself has not the natural power of motion like a living being, so the Word, arousing and moving the whole body, the church, to befitting action, awakens, more-

[1] Cf. Gen. ii. 24. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 17.

over, each individual member belonging to the church, so that they do nothing apart from the Word. Since all this, then, follows by a train of reasoning not to be depreciated, where is the difficulty in maintaining that, as the *soul* of Jesus is joined in a perfect and inconceivable manner with the very Word, so the person of Jesus, generally speaking,[1] is not separated from the only-begotten and first-born of all creation, and is not a different being from Him? But enough here on this subject.

Chapter xlix.

Let us notice now what follows, where, expressing in a single word his opinion regarding the Mosaic cosmogony, without offering, however, a single argument in its support, he finds fault with it, saying: "Moreover, their cosmogony is extremely silly."[2] Now, if he had produced some credible proofs of its silly character, we should have endeavoured to answer them; but it does not appear to me reasonable that I should be called upon to demonstrate, in answer to his mere *assertion*, that it is *not* "silly." If any one, however, wishes to see the reasons which led us to accept the Mosaic account, and the arguments by which it may be defended, he may read what we have written upon Genesis, from the beginning of the book up to the passage, "And this is the book of the generation of men,"[3] where we have tried to show from the Holy Scriptures themselves what the "heaven" was which was created in the beginning; and what the "earth," and the "invisible part of the earth," and that which was "without form;"[4] and what the "deep" was, and the "darkness" that was upon it; and what the "water" was, and the "Spirit of God" which was "borne over it;" and what the "light" which was created, and what the "firmament," as distinct from the "heaven" which was created in the beginning; and so on with the other subjects that follow. Celsus has also expressed his opinion that the narrative of the creation of man is "exceedingly silly," without stating any proofs, or endeavouring to answer our arguments; for he had no evidence, in my judgment, which was

[1] ἁπαξαπλῶς.
[2] μάλα εὐηθική.
[3] Cf. Gen. v. 1.
[4] ἀκατασκεύαστον.

fitted to overthrow the statement that "man has been made in the image of God."[1] He does not even understand the meaning of the "Paradise" that was planted by God, and of the life which man first led in it; and of that which resulted from accident,[2] when man was cast forth on account of his sin, and was settled opposite the Paradise of delight. Now, as he asserts that these are silly statements, let him turn his attention not merely to each one of them [in general], but to this in particular, "He placed the cherubim, and the flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life,"[3] and say whether Moses wrote these words with no serious object in view, but in the spirit of the writers of the old Comedy, who have sportively related that "Prœtus slew Bellerophon," and that "Pegasus came from Arcadia." Now their object was to create laughter in composing such stories; whereas it is incredible that he who left behind him laws[4] for a whole nation, regarding which he wished to persuade his subjects that they were given by God, should have written words so little to the purpose,[5] and have said without any meaning, "He placed the cherubim, and the flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life," or made any other statement regarding the creation of man, which is the subject of philosophic investigation by the Hebrew sages.

Chapter L.

In the next place, Celsus, after heaping together, simply as mere assertions, the varying opinions of some of the ancients regarding the world, and the origin of man, alleges that "Moses and the prophets, who have left to us our books, not knowing at all what the nature of the world is, and of man, have woven together a web of sheer nonsense."[6] If he had shown, now, *how* it appeared to him that the Holy Scriptures contained "sheer nonsense," we should have tried to demolish the arguments which appeared to him to establish their nonsensical character; but on the present occasion, following his own example, we also sportively give it as our opinion that Celsus,

[1] Cf. Gen. i. 26.
[2] τὴν ἐκ περιστάσεως γενομένην.
[3] Gen. iii. 24.
[4] γραφάς.
[5] ἀπρόσλογα.
[6] συνθεῖναι λῆρον βαθύν.

knowing nothing at all about the nature of the meaning and language of the prophets,[1] composed a work which contained "sheer nonsense," and boastfully gave it the title of a "true discourse." And since he makes the statements about the "days of creation" ground of accusation,—as if he understood them clearly and correctly, some of which elapsed *before* the creation of light and heaven, and sun, and moon, and stars, and some of them *after* the creation of these,—we shall only make this observation, that Moses must then have forgotten that he had said a little before, "that in six days the creation of the world had been finished," and that in consequence of this act of forgetfulness he subjoins to these words the following: "This is the book of the creation of man, in the day when God made the heaven and the earth!" But it is not in the least credible, that after what he had said respecting the six days, Moses should immediately add, without a special meaning, the words, "in the day that God made the heavens and the earth;" and if any one thinks that these words may be referred to the statement, "In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth," let him observe that before the words, "Let there be light, and there was light," and these, "God called the light day," it has been stated that "in the beginning God made the heaven and the earth."

Chapter LI.

On the present occasion, however, it is not our object to enter into an explanation of the subject of intelligent and sensible beings,[2] nor of the manner in which the different kinds[3] of days were allotted to both sorts, nor to investigate the details which belong to the subject, for we should need whole treatises for the exposition of the Mosaic cosmogony; and that work we had already performed, to the best of our ability, a considerable time before the commencement of this answer to Celsus, when we discussed with such measure of capacity as we then possessed the question of the Mosaic cosmogony of the six days. We must keep in mind, however, that the Word promises to the righteous through the mouth of Isaiah, that days

[1] ὅτι τίς ποτέ ἐστιν ἡ φύσις τοῦ νοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις λόγου.
[2] περὶ νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν. [3] αἱ φύσεις τῶν ἡμερῶν.

will come[1] when not the sun, but the Lord Himself, will be to them an everlasting light, and God will be their glory.[2] And it is from misunderstanding, I think, some pestilent heresy which gave an erroneous interpretation to the words, "Let there be light," as if they were the expression of a *wish*[3] merely on the part of the Creator, that Celsus made the remark: "The Creator did not borrow light from above, like those persons who kindle their lamps at those of their neighbours." Misunderstanding, moreover, another impious heresy, he has said: "If, indeed, there did exist an accursed god opposed to the great God, who did this contrary to his approval, why did he lend him the light?" So far are we from offering a defence of such puerilities, that we desire, on the contrary, distinctly to arraign the statements of these heretics as erroneous, and to undertake to refute, not those of their opinions with which we are *unacquainted*, as Celsus does, but those of which we have attained an accurate knowledge, derived in part from the statements of their own adherents, and partly from a careful perusal of their writings.

Chapter lii.

Celsus proceeds as follows: "With regard to the origin of the world and its destruction, whether it is to be regarded as uncreated and indestructible, or as created indeed, but not destructible, or the reverse, I at present say nothing." For this reason we too say nothing on these points, as the work in hand does not require it. Nor do we allege that the Spirit of the universal God mingled itself in things here below as in things alien to itself,[4] as might appear from the expression, "The Spirit of God moved upon the water;" nor do we assert that certain wicked devices directed against His Spirit, as if by a different creator from the great God, and which were tolerated by the Supreme Divinity, needed to be completely frustrated. And, accordingly, I have nothing further to say to those[5] who utter such absurdities; nor to Celsus, who does not refute them with ability. For he ought either *not* to have mentioned such matters at all, or else, in keeping with that character for

[1] ἐν καταστάσει ἔσεσθαι ἡμέρας. [2] Cf. Isa. lx. 19. [3] εὐκτικῶς.
[4] ὡς ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις τοῖς τῇδε. [5] μακρὰν χαιρέτωσαν.

philanthropy which he assumes, have carefully set them forth, and then endeavoured to rebut these impious assertions. Nor have we ever heard that the great God, after giving his spirit to the creator, demands it back again. Proceeding next foolishly to assail these impious assertions, he asks: "What god gives anything with the intention of demanding it back? For it is the mark of a needy person to demand back [what he has given], whereas God stands in need of nothing." To this he adds, as if saying something clever against certain parties: "Why, when he lent [his spirit], was he ignorant that he was lending it to an evil being?" He asks, further: "Why does he pass without notice[1] a wicked creator who was counterworking his purposes?"

Chapter liii.

In the next place, mixing up together various heresies, and not observing that some statements are the utterances of one heretical sect, and others of a different one, he brings forward the objections which we raised against Marcion.[2] And, probably, having heard them from some paltry and ignorant individuals,[3] he assails the very arguments which combat them, but not in a way that shows much intelligence. Quoting then our arguments against Marcion, and not observing that it is *against* Marcion that he is speaking, he asks: "Why does he send secretly, and destroy the works which he has created? Why does he secretly employ force, and persuasion, and deceit? Why does he allure those who, as ye assert, have been condemned or accused by him, and carry them away like a slave-dealer? Why does he teach them to steal away from their Lord? Why to flee from their father? Why does he claim them for himself against the father's will? Why does he profess to be the father of strange children?" To these questions he subjoins the following remark, as if by way of expressing his surprise:[4] "Venerable, indeed, is the

[1] περιορᾷ.

[2] Cf. Book v. c. 54.

[3] The textual reading is, ἀπό τινων εὐτελῶς καὶ ἰδιωτικῶς, for which Ruæus reads, ἀπό τινων εὐτελῶν καὶ ἰδιωτικῶν, which emendation has been adopted in the translation.

[4] οἱονεὶ θαυμαστικῶς.

god who desires to be the father of those sinners who are condemned by another [god], and of the needy,[1] and, as themselves say, of the very offscourings[2] [of men], and who is unable to capture and punish his messenger, who escaped from him!" After this, as if addressing us who acknowledge that this world is not the work of a different and strange god, he continues in the following strain: "If these are his works, how is it that God created evil? And how is it that he cannot persuade and admonish [men]? And how is it that he repents on account of the ingratitude and wickedness of men? He finds fault, moreover, with his own handwork,[3] and hates, and threatens, and destroys his own offspring? Whither can he transport them out of this world, which he himself has made?" Now it does not appear to me that by these remarks he makes clear what "evil" is; and although there have been among the Greeks many sects who differ as to the nature of good and evil, he hastily concludes, as if it were a consequence of our maintaining that this world also is a work of the universal God, that in *our* judgment *God* is the author of evil. Let it be, however, regarding evil as it may—whether created by God or not—it nevertheless follows only as a *result* when you compare the principal design.[4] And I am greatly surprised if the inference regarding God's authorship of evil, which he thinks follows from our maintaining that this world also is the work of the universal God, does not follow too from his *own* statements. For one might say to Celsus: "If these are His works, how is it that God created evil? and how is it that He cannot persuade and admonish men?" It is indeed the greatest error in reasoning to accuse those who are of different opinions of holding unsound doctrines, when the accuser himself is much more liable to the same charge with regard to his own.

Chapter liv.

Let us see, then, briefly what Holy Scripture has to say regarding good and evil, and what answer we are to return to the questions, "How is it that God created evil?" and, "How

[1] ἀκλήρων. [2] σκυβάλων. [3] τέχνην.
[4] ἐκ παρακολουθήσεως γεγένηται τῆς πρὸς τὰ προηγούμενα.

is He incapable of persuading and admonishing men?" Now, according to Holy Scripture, properly speaking, virtues and virtuous actions are good, as, properly speaking, the reverse of these are evil. We shall be satisfied with quoting on the present occasion some verses from the 34th Psalm, to the following effect: "They that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing. Come, ye children, hearken unto me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil, and do good."[1] Now, the injunctions to "depart from evil, and to do good," do not refer either to *corporeal* evils or *corporeal* blessings, as they are termed by some, nor to external things at all, but to blessings and evils of a *spiritual* kind; since he who departs from such evils, and performs such virtuous actions, will, as one who desires the true life, come to the enjoyment of it; and as one loving to see "good days," in which the word of righteousness will be the Sun, he will see them, God taking him away from this "present evil world,"[2] and from those evil days concerning which Paul said: "Redeeming the time, because the days are evil."[3]

Chapter lv.

Passages, indeed, might be found where corporeal and external [benefits] are improperly[4] called "good,"—those things, viz., which contribute to the natural life, while those which do the reverse are termed "evil." It is in this sense that Job says to his wife: "If we have received good at the hand of the Lord, shall we not also receive evil?"[5] Since, then, there is found in the sacred Scriptures, in a certain passage, this statement put into the mouth of God, "I make peace, and create evil;"[6] and again another, where it is said of Him that "evil came down from the Lord to the gate of Jerusalem, the noise of chariots and horsemen,"[7]—passages which have disturbed many readers of Scripture, who are unable to see what Scrip-

[1] Cf. Ps. xxxiv. 10–14. [2] Cf. Gal. i. 4. [3] Cf. Eph. v. 16.
[4] καταχρηστικώτερον. [5] Cf. Job ii. 10. [6] Cf. Isa. xlv. 7.
[7] Cf. Mic. i. 12, 13. The rendering of the Heb. in the first clause of the thirteenth verse is different from that of the LXX.

ture means by "good" and "evil,"—it is probable that Celsus, being perplexed thereby, gave utterance to the question, "How is it that God created evil?" or, perhaps, having heard some one discussing the matters relating to it in an ignorant manner, he made this statement which we have noticed. We, on the other hand, maintain that "evil," or "wickedness," and the actions which proceed from it, were *not* created by God. For if God created that which is *really* evil, how was it possible that the proclamation regarding [the last] judgment should be confidently announced,[1] which informs us that the wicked are to be punished for their evil deeds in proportion to the amount of their wickedness, while those who have lived a virtuous life, or performed virtuous actions, will be in the enjoyment of blessedness, and will receive rewards from God? I am well aware that those who would daringly assert that these evils were created by God will quote certain expressions of Scripture [in their support], because we are not able to show one consistent series[2] of passages; for although Scripture [generally] blames the wicked and approves of the righteous, it nevertheless contains some statements which, although comparatively[3] few in number, seem to disturb the minds of ignorant readers of Holy Scripture. I have not, however, deemed it appropriate to my present treatise to quote on the present occasion those discordant statements, which are many in number,[4] and their explanations, which would require a long arrray of proofs. Evils, then, if those be meant which are *properly* so called, were *not* created by God; but some, although *few* in comparison with the order of the *whole* world, *have* resulted from His principal works, as there follow from the chief works of the carpenter such things as spiral shavings and sawdust,[5] or as architects might appear to be the cause of the rubbish[6] which lies around their buildings in the form of the filth which drops from the stones and the plaster.

[1] παῤῥησίαν ἔχειν. [2] ὕφος.

[3] ὀλίγα must be taken *comparatively*, on account of the πολλάς that follows afterwards.

[4] πολλάς. See note 3. [5] τὰ ἑλικοειδῆ ξέσματα καὶ πρίσματα.

[6] τὰ παρακείμενα.

Chapter lvi.

If we speak, however, of what are called "corporeal" and "external" evils,—which are improperly so termed,—then it may be granted that there *are* occasions when some of these have been called into existence by God, in order that by their means the conversion of certain individuals might be effected. And what absurdity would follow from such a course? For as, if we should hear those sufferings[1] improperly termed "evils" which are inflicted by fathers, and instructors, and pedagogues upon those who are under their care, or upon patients who are operated upon or cauterized by the surgeons in order to effect a cure, we were to say that a father was ill-treating his son, or pedagogues and instructors their pupils, or physicians their patients, no blame would be laid upon the operators or chastisers; so, in the same way, if God is said to bring upon men such evils for the conversion and cure of those who need this discipline, there would be no absurdity in the view, nor would "evils come down from the Lord upon the gates of Jerusalem,"[2] —which evils consist of the punishments inflicted upon the Israelites by their enemies with a view to their conversion; nor would one visit "with a rod the transgressions of those who forsake the law of the Lord, and their iniquities with stripes;"[3] nor could it be said, "Thou hast coals of fire to set upon them; they shall be to thee a help."[4] In the same way also we explain the expressions, "I, who make peace, and create evil;"[5] for He calls into existence "corporeal" or "external" evils, while purifying and training those who would not be disciplined by the word and sound doctrine. This, then, is our answer to the question, "How is it that God created evil?"

Chapter lvii.

With respect to the question, "How is he incapable of persuading and admonishing men?" it has been already stated that, if such an objection were really a ground of charge, then the objection of Celsus might be brought against those who accept the doctrine of providence. Any one might answer the charge

[1] πόνους. [2] Cf. Mic. i. 12. [3] Cf. Ps. lxxxix. 32.
[4] Cf. Isa. xlvii. 14, 15. [5] Cf. Isa. xlv. 7.

that God is incapable of admonishing men; for He conveys His admonitions throughout the whole of Scripture, and by means of those persons who, through God's gracious appointment, are the instructors of His hearers. Unless, indeed, some peculiar meaning be understood to attach to the word "admonish," as if it signified both to penetrate into the mind of the person admonished, and to make him hear the words of his[1] instructor, which is contrary to the usual meaning of the word. To the objection, "How is he incapable of persuading?"—which also might be brought against all who believe in providence,—we have to make the following remarks. Since the expression "to be persuaded" belongs to those words which are termed, so to speak, "reciprocal"[2] (compare the phrase "to shave a man," when he makes an effort to submit himself to the barber[3]), there is for this reason needed not merely the effort of him who persuades, but also the submission, so to speak, which is to be yielded to the persuader, or the acceptance of what is said by him. And therefore it must not be said that it is because God is *incapable* of persuading men that they are not persuaded, but because they will not accept the faithful words of God. And if one were to apply this expression to men who are the "artificers of persuasion,"[4] he would not be wrong; for it is possible for a man who has thoroughly learned the principles of rhetoric, and who employs them properly, to do his utmost to persuade, and yet appear to fail, because he cannot overcome the will of him who ought to yield to his persuasive arts. Moreover, that persuasion does not come from God, although persuasive words may be uttered by him, is distinctly taught by Paul, when he says: "This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you."[5] Such also is the view indicated by these words: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, a sword shall devour you."[6] For that one may [really] desire what is addressed to him by one who admonishes, and may become deserving of

[1] τὸ καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνειν ἐν τῷ νουθετουμένῳ καὶ ἀκούειν τὸν τοῦ διδάσκοντος λόγον.

[2] ὡσπερεὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἀντιπεπονθότων ἔστιν.

[3] ἀνάλογον τῷ κείρεσθαι ἄνθρωπον, ἐνεργοῦντα τὸ παρέχειν ἑαυτὸν τῷ κείροντι.

[4] πειθοῦς δημιουργῶν. [5] Cf. Gal. v. 8. [6] Cf. Isa. i. 19, 20.

those promises of God which he hears, it is necessary to secure the will of the hearer, and his inclination to what is addressed to him. And therefore it appears to me, that in the book of Deuteronomy the following words are uttered with peculiar emphasis: "And now, O Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, and to walk in all His ways, and to love Him, and to keep His commandments?"[1]

Chapter lviii.

There is next to be answered the following query: "And how is it that he repents when men become ungrateful and wicked; and finds fault with his own handwork, and hates, and threatens, and destroys his own offspring?" Now Celsus here calumniates and falsifies what is written in the book of Genesis to the following effect: "And the Lord God, seeing that the wickedness of men upon the earth was increasing, and that every one in his heart carefully meditated to do evil continually, was grieved[2] He had made man upon the earth. And God meditated in His heart, and said, I will destroy man, whom I have made, from the face of the earth, both man and beast, and creeping thing, and fowl of the air, because I am grieved[3] that I made them;"[4] quoting words which are not written in Scripture, as if they conveyed the meaning of what was actually written. For there is no mention in these words of the repentance of God, nor of His blaming and hating His own handwork. And if there is the appearance of God threatening the catastrophe of the deluge, and thus destroying His own children in it, we have to answer that, as the soul of man is immortal, the supposed threatening has for its object the conversion of the hearers, while the destruction of men by the flood is a purification of the earth, as certain among the Greek philosophers of no mean repute have indicated by the expression: "When the gods purify the earth."[5] And with

[1] Cf. Deut. x. 12, 13.

[2] ἐνεθυμήθη, in all probability a corruption for ἐθυμώθη, which Hoeschel places in the text, and Spencer in the margin of his ed.: Heb. וַיִּנָּחֶם.

[3] ἐνεθυμήθην. Cf. remark in note 2.

[4] Cf. Gen. vi. 5, 6.

[5] Cf. Plato in *Timæo*.

respect to the transference to God of those anthropopathic phrases, some remarks have been already made by us in the preceding pages.

Chapter lix.

Celsus, in the next place, suspecting, or perhaps seeing clearly enough, the answer which might be returned by those who defend the destruction of men by the deluge, continues: "But if he does not destroy his own offspring, whither does he convey them out of this world[1] which he himself created?" To this we reply, that God by no means removes out of the whole world, consisting of heaven and earth, those who suffered death by the deluge, but removes them from a life in the flesh, and, having set them free from their bodies, liberates them at the same time from an existence upon earth, which in many parts of Scripture it is usual to call the "world." In the Gospel according to John especially, we may frequently find the regions of earth[2] termed "world," as in the passage, "He was the true light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the 'world;'"[3] as also in this, "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."[4] If, then, we understand by "removing out of the world" a transference from "regions on earth," there is nothing absurd in the expression. If, on the contrary, the system of things which consists of heaven and earth be termed "world," then those who perished in the deluge are by no means removed out of the so-called "world." And yet, indeed, if we have regard to the words, "Looking not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen;"[5] and also to these, "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,"[6]—we might say that he who dwells amid the "invisible" things, and what are called generally "things not seen," *is* gone out of the world, the Word having removed him hence, and transported him to the heavenly regions, in order to behold all beautiful things.

[1] κόσμος.
[2] τὸν περίγειον τόπον.
[3] Cf. John i. 9.
[4] Cf. John xvi. 33.
[5] Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 18.
[6] Cf. Rom. i. 20.

Chapter lx.

But after this investigation of his assertions, as if his object were to swell his book by many words, he repeats, in different language, the same charges which we have examined a little ago, saying: "By far the most silly thing is the distribution of the creation of the world over certain days, *before days existed:* for, as the heaven was not yet created, nor the foundation of the earth yet laid,[1] nor the sun yet revolving,[2] how could there be *days?*" Now, what difference is there between these words and the following: "Moreover, taking and looking at these things from the beginning, would it not be absurd in the first and greatest God to issue the command, Let this [first thing] come into existence, and this second thing, and this [third]; and after accomplishing so much on the first day, to do so much more again on the second, and third, and fourth, and fifth, and sixth?" We answered to the best of our ability this objection to God's "commanding this first, second, and third thing to be created," when we quoted the words, "He said, and it was done; He commanded, and all things stood fast;"[3] remarking that the immediate[4] Creator, and, as it were, very Maker[5] of the world was the Word, the Son of God; while the Father of the Word, by commanding His own Son—the Word—to create the world, is *primarily* Creator. And with regard to the creation of the light upon the first day, and of the firmament upon the second, and of the gathering together of the waters that are under the heaven into their several reservoirs[6] on the third (the earth thus causing to sprout forth those [fruits] which are under the control of nature alone[7]), and of the [great] lights and stars upon the fourth, and of aquatic[8] animals upon the fifth, and of land animals and man upon the sixth, we have treated to the best of our ability in our notes upon Genesis, as well as in the foregoing pages, when we found fault with those who, taking the words in their *apparent* signification, said that the time of six days was occupied in the creation of the world, and quoted the words: "These are the

[1] ἐρηρεισμένης.
[2] τῇδε φερομένου.
[3] Cf. Ps. xxxiii. 9.
[4] τὸν προσεχῶς δημιουργόν.
[5] αὐτουργόν.
[6] συναγωγὰς.
[7] τὰ ὑπὸ μόνης φύσεως διοικούμενα.
[8] τὰ νηκτά.

generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."[1]

Chapter lxi.

Again, not understanding the meaning of the words, "And God ended on the sixth day His works which He had made, and ceased[2] on the seventh day from all His works which He had made: and God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it, because on it He had ceased[2] from all His works which He had begun to make;"[3] and imagining the expression, "He *ceased* on the seventh day," to be the same as this, "He *rested*[4] on the seventh day," he makes the remark: "After this, indeed, he is weary, like a very bad workman, who stands in need of rest to refresh himself!" For he knows nothing of the day of the Sabbath and rest of God, which follows the completion of the world's creation, and which lasts during the duration of the world, and in which all those will keep festival with God who have done all *their* works in *their* six days, and who, because they have omitted none of their duties,[5] will ascend to the contemplation [of celestial things], and to the assembly of righteous and blessed beings. In the next place, as if either the Scriptures made such a statement, or as if we ourselves so spoke of God as having rested from fatigue, he continues: "It is not in keeping with the fitness of things[6] that the first God should feel fatigue, or work with His hands,[7] or give forth commands." Celsus says, that "it is not in keeping with the fitness of things that the first God should feel fatigue." Now we would say that neither does God the Word feel fatigue, nor any of those beings who belong to a better and diviner order of things, because the sensation of fatigue is peculiar to those who are in the body. You can examine whether this is true of those who possess a body of any kind, or of those who have an *earthly* body, or one a little better than this. But "neither is it consistent with the fitness of things that the first God should work with His own hands." If you under-

[1] Cf. Gen. ii. 4.
[2] κατέπαυσεν.
[3] Cf. Gen. ii. 2, 3.
[4] ἀνεπαύσατο.
[5] τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων.
[6] οὐ θέμις.
[7] χειρουργεῖν.

stand the words "work with His own hands" *literally*, then neither are they applicable to the *second* God, nor to any other being partaking of divinity. But suppose that they are spoken in an improper and figurative sense, so that we may translate the following expressions, "And the firmament showeth forth His handywork,"[1] and "the heavens are the work of Thy hands,"[2] and any other similar phrases, in a figurative manner, so far as respects the "hands" and "limbs" of Deity, where is the absurdity in the words, "God thus working with His own hands?" And as there is no absurdity in God thus working, so neither is there in His issuing "commands;" so that what is done at His bidding should be beautiful and praiseworthy, because it was God who commanded it to be performed.

Chapter lxii.

Celsus, again, having perhaps misunderstood the words, "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it,"[3] or perhaps because some ignorant individuals had rashly ventured upon the explanation of such things, and not understanding, moreover, on what principles parts called after the names of the bodily members are assigned to the attributes[4] of God, asserts: "He has neither mouth nor voice." Truly, indeed, God can have no voice, if the voice is a concussion of the air, or a stroke on the air, or a species of air, or any other definition which may be given to the voice by those who are skilled in such matters; but what is called the "voice of God" is said to be *seen* as "God's voice" by the people in the passage, "And all the people saw the voice of God;"[5] the word "saw" being taken, agreeably to the custom of Scripture, in a spiritual sense. Moreover, he alleges that "God possesses nothing else of which *we* have any knowledge;" but of what things *we* have knowledge he gives no indication. If he means "limbs," we agree with him, understanding the things "of which we have knowledge" to be those called corporeal, and pretty generally so termed. But if we are to understand the words "of which *we* have knowledge" in a universal sense, then there are many things of which we have know-

[1] Cf. Ps. xix. 1.
[2] Cf. Ps. cii. 25.
[3] Cf. Isa. i. 20.
[4] ἐπὶ τῶν δυνάμεων.
[5] Cf. Ex. xx. 18 (LXX.). The Masoretic text is different.

ledge, [and which may be attributed to God]; for He possesses virtue, and blessedness, and divinity. If we, however, put a higher meaning upon the words, "of which *we* have knowledge," since all that we know is less than God, there is no absurdity in our also admitting that God possesses none of those things "of which *we* have knowledge." For the attributes which belong to God are far superior to all things with which not merely the nature of man is acquainted, but even that of those who have risen far above it. And if he had read the writings of the prophets, David on the one hand saying, "But Thou art the same,"[1] and Malachi on the other, "I am [the Lord], and change not,"[2] he would have observed that none of us assert that there is any change in God, either in act or thought. For abiding the same, He administers mutable things according to their nature, and His word elects to undertake their administration.

Chapter lxiii.

Celsus, not observing the difference between "after the image of God" and "God's image," next asserts that the "first-born of every creature" is the image of God,—the very word and truth, and also the very wisdom, being the image of His goodness, while man has been created *after* the image of God; moreover, that every man whose head is Christ is the image and glory of God;—and further, not observing to which of the characteristics of humanity the expression "after the image of God" belongs, and that it consists in a nature which never had or no longer has "the old man with his deeds," being called "after the image of Him who created it," from its not possessing these qualities,—he maintains: "Neither did He make man His image; for God is not such an one, nor like any other species of [visible] being." Is it possible to suppose that the element which is "after the image of God" should exist in the inferior part—I mean the body—of a compound being like man, because Celsus has explained that to be made after the image of God? For if that which is "after the image of God" be in the body only, the better part, the soul, has been deprived of that which is "after His image," and this [distinction] exists in the corruptible body,—an assertion which

[1] Cf. Ps. cii. 27. [2] Cf. Mal. iii. 6.

is made by none of us. But if that which is "after the image of God" be in *both together*, then God must necessarily be a compound being, and consist, as it were, of soul and body, in order that the element which is "after God's image," the better part, may be in the soul; while the inferior part, and that which "is according to the body," may be in the body,—an assertion, again, which is made by none of us. It remains, therefore, that that which is "after the image of God" must be understood to be in our "inner man," which is also renewed, and whose nature it is to be "after the image of Him who created it," when a man becomes "perfect," as "our Father in heaven is perfect," and hears the command, "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy,"[1] and learning the precept, "Be ye followers of God,"[2] receives into his virtuous soul the traits of God's image. The body, moreover, of him who possesses such a soul is a temple of God; and in the soul God dwells, because it has been made after His image.[3]

Chapter lxiv.

Celsus, again, brings together a number of statements, which he gives as admissions on our part, but which no intelligent Christian would allow. For not one of us asserts that "God partakes of form or colour." Nor does He even partake of "motion," because He stands firm, and His nature is permanent, and He invites the righteous man also to do the same, saying: "But as for thee, stand thou here by me."[4] And if certain expresssions indicate a kind of motion, as it were, on his part, such as this, "They heard the voice of the Lord God *walking* in the garden in the cool of the day,"[5] we must understand them in this way, that it is by sinners that God is understood as moving, or as we understand the "sleep" of God, which is taken in a figurative sense, or His "anger," or any other similar attribute. But "God does not partake even of

[1] Lev. xi. 44. [2] Cf. Eph. v. 1 (*μιμηταί*).

[3] The words as they stand in the text are probably corrupt: we have adopted in the translation the emendation of Guietus: *ἔτι καὶ ναός ἐστι τοῦ Θεοῦ το σῶμα τοῦ τοιαύτην ἔχοντος ψυχὴν, καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ διὰ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα, τὸν Θεόν.*

[4] Deut. v. 31. [5] Cf. Gen. iii. 8.

substance."[1] For He is partaken of [by others] rather than that Himself partakes of them, and He is partaken of by those who have the Spirit of God. Our Saviour, also, does not partake of righteousness; but being Himself "righteousness," He is partaken of *by* the righteous. A discussion about "substance" would be protracted and difficult, and especially if it were a question whether that which is permanent and immaterial be "substance" properly so called, so that it would be found that God is *beyond* "substance," communicating of His "substance," by means of office and power,[2] to those to whom He communicates Himself by His Word, as He does to the Word Himself; or even if He *is* "substance," yet He is said to be in His nature "invisible," in these words respecting our Saviour, who is said to be "the image of the *invisible* God,"[3] while from the term "invisible" it is indicated that He is "immaterial." It is also a question for investigation, whether the "only-begotten" and "first-born of every creature" is to be called "substance of substances," and "idea of ideas," and the "principle of all things," while above all there is His Father and God.

Chapter lxv.

Celsus proceeds to say of God that "of Him are all things," abandoning [in so speaking], I know not how, all his principles;[4] while our Paul declares, that "of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things,"[5] showing that He is the beginning of the substance of all things by the words "of Him," and the bond of their subsistence by the expression "through Him," and their final end by the terms "to Him." Of a truth, God is of nothing. But when Celsus adds, that "He is not to be reached by word,"[6] I make a distinction, and say that if he means the word that is in *us*—whether the word conceived in the mind, or the word that is uttered[7]—I, too, admit that God is not to be reached by word. If, however, we attend to the passage, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was

[1] οὐσία. [2] πρεσβείᾳ καὶ δυνάμει. [3] Cf. Col. i. 15.

[4] For αὐτοῦ Boherellus conjectures αὑτοῦ, and translates, "*Propria ipse principia*, quæ sunt Epicuri, *subruens*."

[5] Rom. xi. 36. [6] οὐδὲ λογῷ ἐφικτός.

[7] εἴτε ἐνδιαθέτῳ εἴτε καὶ προφορικῷ.

with God, and the Word was God,"[1] we are of opinion that God is to be reached by *this* Word, and is comprehended not by Him only, but by any one whatever to whom He may reveal the Father; and thus we shall prove the falsity of the assertion of Celsus, when he says, "Neither is God to be reached by word." The statement, moreover, that "He cannot be expressed by name," requires to be taken with a distinction. If he means, indeed, that there is no word or sign[2] that can represent the attributes of God, the statement is true, since there are many qualities which cannot be indicated by words. Who, for example, could describe in words the difference betwixt the quality of sweetness in a palm and that in a fig? And who could distinguish and set forth in words the peculiar qualities of each individual thing? It is no wonder, then, if in this way God cannot be described by name. But if you take the phrase to mean that it is possible to represent by words something of God's attributes, in order to lead the hearer by the hand,[3] as it were, and so enable him to comprehend something of God, so far as attainable by human nature, then there is no absurdity in saying that "He *can* be described by name." And we make a similar distinction with regard to the expression, "for He has undergone no suffering that can be conveyed by words." It *is* true that the Deity is beyond all suffering. And so much on this point.

Chapter LXVI.

Let us look also at his next statement, in which he introduces, as it were, a certain person, who, after hearing what has been said, expresses himself in the following manner, "How, then, shall I know God? and how shall I learn the way that leads to Him? And how will you show Him to me? Because now, indeed, you throw darkness before my eyes, and I see nothing distinctly." He then answers, as it were, the individual who is thus perplexed, and thinks that he assigns the reason why darkness has been poured upon the eyes of him who uttered the foregoing words, when he asserts that "those whom one would lead forth out of darkness into the brightness of light, being unable to withstand its splendours, have their

[1] John i. i. [2] οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν λέξεσι καὶ σημαινομένοις. [3] χειραγωγῆσαι.

power of vision affected [1] and injured, and so imagine that they are smitten with blindness." In answer to this, we would say that all those indeed sit in darkness, and are rooted in it, who fix their gaze upon the evil handiwork of painters, and moulders and sculptors, and who will not look upwards, and ascend in thought from all visible and sensible things, to the Creator of all things, who is light; while, on the other hand, every one is in light who has followed the radiance of the Word, who has shown in consequence of what ignorance, and impiety, and want of knowledge of divine things these objects were worshipped instead of God, and who has conducted the soul of him who desires to be saved towards the uncreated God, who is over all. For "the people that sat in darkness—the Gentiles—saw a great light, and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up," [2]—the God Jesus. No Christian, then, would give Celsus, or any accuser of the divine Word, the answer, "How shall I know God?" for each one of them knows God according to his capacity. And no one asks, "How shall I learn the way which leads to Him?" because he has heard Him who says, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life," [3] and has tasted, in the course of the journey, the happiness which results from it. And not a single Christian would say to Celsus, "How will you show me God?"

Chapter lxvii.

The remark, indeed, was true which Celsus made, that any one, on hearing his words, would answer, seeing that his words *are* words of darkness, "You pour darkness before my eyes." Celsus verily, and those like him, do desire to pour darkness before our eyes: we, however, by means of the light of the Word, disperse the darkness of their impious opinions. The Christian, indeed, could retort on Celsus, who says nothing that is distinct or true, "I see nothing that is distinct among all *your* statements." It is not, therefore, "out of darkness" into "the brightness of light" that Celsus leads us forth: he wishes, on the contrary, to transport us from light into darkness, making the darkness light and the light darkness, and exposing himself to the woe well described by the prophet Isaiah in the

[1] κολάζεσθαι. [2] Cf. Matt. iv. 16 and Isa. ix. 2. [3] John xiv. 6.

following manner: "Woe unto them that put darkness for light, and light for darkness."[1] But we, the eyes of whose soul have been opened by the Word, and who see the difference between light and darkness, prefer by all means to take our stand "in the light," and will have nothing to do with darkness at all. The true light, moreover, being endued with life, knows to whom his full splendours are to be manifested, and to whom his light; for he does not display his brilliancy on account of the still existing weakness in the eyes of the recipient. And if we must speak at all of "sight being affected and injured," what other eyes shall we say are in this condition, than his who is involved in ignorance of God, and who is prevented by his passions from seeing the truth? Christians, however, by no means consider that they are blinded by the words of Celsus, or any other who is opposed to the worship of God. But let those who perceive that they are blinded by following multitudes who are in error, and tribes of those who keep festivals to demons, draw near to the Word, who can bestow the gift of sight,[2] in order that, like those poor and blind who had thrown themselves down by the wayside, and who were healed by Jesus because they said to Him, "Son of David, have mercy upon me," they too may receive mercy and recover their eyesight,[3] fresh and beautiful, as the Word of God can create it.

Chapter LXVIII.

Accordingly, if Celsus were to ask us how we think we know God, and how we shall be saved by Him, we would answer that the Word of God, which entered into those who seek Him, or who accept Him when He appears, is able to make known and to reveal the Father, who was not seen [by any one] before the appearance of the Word. And who else is able to save and conduct the soul of man to the God of all things, save God the Word, who, "being in the beginning with God," became flesh for the sake of those who had cleaved to the flesh, and had become as flesh, that He might be received by those who could not behold Him, inasmuch as He was the Word, and was with God, and was God? And discoursing in human form,[4] and announcing Himself as flesh, He calls to

[1] Cf. Isa. v. 20. [2] ὀφθαλμούς. [3] ὀφθαλμούς. [4] σωματικῶς.

Himself those who are flesh, that He may in the first place cause them to be transformed according to the Word that was made flesh, and afterwards may lead them upwards to behold Him as He was before He became flesh; so that they, receiving the benefit, and ascending from their great introduction to Him, which was according to the flesh, say, "Even if we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we Him no more." Therefore He became flesh, and having become flesh, "He tabernacled among us," not dwelling without us; and after tabernacling and dwelling *within* us, He did not continue in the form in which He first presented Himself, but caused us to ascend to the lofty mountain of His word, and showed us His own glorious form, and the splendour of His garments; and not His own form alone, but that also of the spiritual law, which is Moses, seen in glory along with Jesus. He showed to us, moreover, all prophecy, which did not perish even after His incarnation, but was received up into heaven, and whose symbol was Elijah. And he who beheld these things could say, "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."[1] Celsus, then, has exhibited considerable ignorance in the imaginary answer to his question which he puts into our mouth, "How we think we can know God? and how we know we shall be saved by Him?" for our answer is what we have just stated.

Chapter lxix.

Celsus, however, asserts that the answer which we give is based upon a probable conjecture,[2] admitting that he describes our answer in the following terms: "Since God is great and difficult to see,[3] He put His own Spirit into a body that resembled ours, and sent it down to us, that we might be enabled to hear Him and become acquainted with Him." But the God and Father of all things is not the only being that is great in our judgment; for He has imparted [a share] of Himself and His greatness to His only-begotten and first-born of every creature, in order that He, being the image of the invisible God, might preserve, even in His greatness, the image of the Father. For it was not possible that there could exist

[1] Cf. John i. 14. [2] εἰκότι στοχασμῷ. [3] δυσθεώρητος.

a well-proportioned,[1] so to speak, and beautiful image of the invisible God, which did not at the same time preserve the image of His greatness. God, moreover, is in our judgment invisible, because He is not a body, while He *can* be seen by those who see with the heart, that is, the understanding; not indeed with any kind of heart, but with one which is pure. For it is inconsistent with the fitness of things that a polluted heart should look upon God; for that must be itself pure which would worthily behold that which is pure. Let it be granted, indeed, that God is "difficult to see," yet He is not the only being who is so; for His Only-begotten also is "difficult to see." For God the Word is "difficult to see," and so also is His[2] wisdom, by which God created all things. For who is capable of seeing the wisdom which is displayed in each individual part of the whole system of things, and by which God created every individual thing? It was not, then, because God was "difficult to see" that He sent God His Son to be an object "easy to be seen."[3] And because Celsus does not understand this, he has represented us as saying, "Because God was 'difficult to see,' He put His own Spirit in a body resembling ours, and sent it down to us, that we might be enabled to hear Him and become acquainted with Him." Now, as we have stated, the Son also is "difficult to see," because He is God the Word, through whom all things were made, and who "tabernacled amongst us."

Chapter LXX.

If Celsus, indeed, had understood our teaching regarding the Spirit of God, and had known that "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God,"[4] he would not have returned to himself the answer which he represents as coming from us, that "God put His own Spirit into a body, and sent it down to us;" for God is perpetually bestowing of His own Spirit to those who are capable of receiving it, although it is not by way of division and separation that He dwells in [the hearts of] the deserving. Nor is the Spirit, in our opinion, a "body," any more than fire is a "body," which

[1] *σύμμετρον.*

[2] For *οὑτωσὶ* we have adopted the conjecture of Guietus, *τούτου.*

[3] *ὡς εὐθεώρητον.*

[4] Rom. viii. 14.

God is said to be in the passage, "Our God is a consuming fire."[1] For all these are figurative expressions, employed to denote the nature of "intelligent beings" by means of familiar and corporeal terms. In the same way, too, if sins are called "wood, and straw, and stubble," we shall not maintain that sins are corporeal; and if blessings are termed "gold, and silver, and precious stones,"[2] we shall not maintain that blessings are "corporeal;" so also, if God be said to be a fire that consumes wood, and straw, and stubble, and all substance[3] of sin, we shall not understand Him to be a "body," so neither do we understand Him to be a body if He should be called "fire." In this way, if God be called "spirit,"[4] we do not mean that He is a "body." For it is the custom of Scripture to give to "intelligent beings" the names of "spirits" and "spiritual things," by way of distinction from those which are the objects of "sense;" as when Paul says, "But our sufficiency is of God, who hath also made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,"[5] where by the "letter" he means that "exposition of Scripture which is apparent to the senses,"[6] while by the "spirit" that which is the object of the "understanding." It is the same, too, with the expression, "God is a Spirit." And because the prescriptions of the law were obeyed both by Samaritans and Jews in a corporeal and literal[7] manner, our Saviour said to the Samaritan woman, "The hour is coming, when neither in Jerusalem, nor in this mountain, shall ye worship the Father. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."[8] And by these words He taught men that God must be worshipped not in the flesh, and with fleshly sacrifices, but in the spirit. And He will be understood to be a Spirit in proportion as the worship rendered to Him is rendered in spirit, and with understanding. It is not, however, with images[9] that

[1] Cf. Heb. xii. 29. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 12. [3] πᾶσαν οὐσίαν.

[4] πνεῦμα. There is an allusion to the two meanings of πνεῦμα, "wind" and "spirit."

[5] 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6. [6] τὴν αἰσθητὴν ἐκδοχήν.

[7] τυπικῶς here evidently must have the above meaning

[8] Cf. John iv. 21, 24. [9] ἐν τύποις.

we are to worship the Father, but "in truth," which "came by Jesus Christ," after the giving of the law by Moses. For when we turn to the Lord (and the Lord is a Spirit[1]), He takes away the veil which lies upon the heart when Moses is read.

Chapter LXXI.

Celsus accordingly, as not understanding the doctrine relating to the Spirit of God ("for the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned"[2]), weaves together [such a web] as pleases himself,[3] imagining that we, in calling God a Spirit, differ in no respect in this particular from the Stoics among the Greeks, who maintain that "God is a Spirit, diffused through all things, and containing all things within Himself." Now the superintendence and providence of God does extend through all things, but not in the way that spirit does, according to the Stoics. Providence indeed contains all things that are its objects, and comprehends them all, but not as a containing body includes its contents, because they also are "body,"[4] but as a *divine* power does it comprehend what it contains. According to the philosophers of the Porch, indeed, who assert that principles are "corporeal," and who on that account make all things perishable, and who venture even to make the God of all things capable of perishing, the very Word of God, who descends even to the lowest of mankind, would be—did it not appear to them to be too gross an incongruity[5]—nothing else than a "corporeal" spirit; whereas, in our opinion,—who endeavour to demonstrate that the rational soul is superior to all "corporeal" nature, and that it is an invisible substance, and incorporeal,—God the Word, by whom all things were made, who came, in order that all things might be made by the Word, not to men only, but to what are deemed the very lowest of things, under the dominion of nature alone, would be no body. The Stoics, then, may consign all things to destruction by fire; we, however, know of no incorporeal substance that is destructible

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 17. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14. [3] ἑαυτῷ συνάπτει.
[4] οὐχ ὡς σῶμα δὲ περιέχον περιέχει, ὅτι καὶ σῶμα ἐστι τὸ περιεχόμενον.
[5] πάνυ ἀπεμφαῖνον.

by fire, nor [do we believe] that the soul of man, or the substance of "angels," or of "thrones," or "dominions," or "principalities," or "powers," can be dissolved by fire.

Chapter lxxii.

It is therefore in vain that Celsus asserts, as one who knows not the nature of the Spirit of God, that "as the Son of God, who existed in a human body, is a Spirit, this very Son of God would not be immortal." He next becomes confused in his statements, as if there were some of us who did not admit that God is a Spirit, but maintain that only with regard to His Son, and he thinks that he can answer us by saying that there "is no kind of spirit which lasts for ever." This is much the same as if, when we term God a "consuming fire," he were to say that there "is no kind of fire which lasts for ever;" not observing the sense in which we say that our God is a fire, and what the things are which He consumes, viz. sins, and wickedness. For it becomes a God of goodness, after each individual has shown, by his efforts, what kind of combatant he has been, to consume vice by the fire of His chastisements. He proceeds, in the next place, to assume what we do not maintain, that "God must necessarily have given up the ghost;" from which also it follows that Jesus could not have risen again with His body. For God would not have received back the spirit which He had surrendered after it had been stained by contact with the body. It is foolish, however, for us to answer statements as ours which were never made by us.

Chapter lxxiii.

He proceeds to repeat himself, and after saying a great deal which he had said before, and ridiculing the birth of God from a virgin,—to which we have already replied as we best could,—he adds the following: "If God had wished to send down His Spirit from Himself, what need was there to breathe it into the womb of a woman? For as one who knew already how to form men, He could also have fashioned a body for this person, without casting His own Spirit into so much pollution;[1] and in this way He would not have been received with incredulity, if

[1] εἰς τοσοῦτον μίασμα.

He had derived His existence immediately from above." He has made these remarks, because he knows not the pure and virgin birth, unaccompanied by any corruption, of that body which was to minister to the salvation of men. For, quoting the sayings of the Stoics,[1] and affecting not to know the doctrine about "things indifferent," he thinks that the divine nature was cast amid pollution, and was stained either by being in the body of a woman, until a body was formed around it, or by assuming a body. And in this he acts like those who imagine that the sun's rays are polluted by dung and by foul-smelling bodies, and do not remain pure amid such things. If, however, according to the view of Celsus, the body of Jesus had been fashioned without generation, those who beheld the body would at once have believed that it had not been formed by generation; and yet an object, when seen, does not at the same time indicate the nature of that from which it has derived its origin. For example, suppose that there were some honey [placed before one] which had not been manufactured by bees, no one could tell from the taste or sight that it was not their workmanship, because the honey which comes from bees does not make known its origin by the senses,[2] but experience alone can tell that it does not proceed from them. In the same way, too, experience teaches that wine comes from the vine, for taste does not enable us to distinguish [the wine] which comes from the vine. In the same manner, therefore, the visible[3] body does not make known the manner of its existence. And you will be induced to accept this view,[4] by [regarding] the heavenly bodies, whose existence and splendour we perceive as we gaze at them; and yet, I presume, their appearance does not suggest to us whether they are created or uncreated; and accordingly different opinions have existed on these points. And yet those who say that they are created are not agreed as to the manner of their creation, for their appearance does not suggest it, although the force of reason[5] may have discovered that they are created, and how their creation was effected.

[1] Cf. Book iv. cc. 14 and 68.

[2] τῇ αἰσθήσει τὴν ἀρχήν.

[3] τὸ αἰσθητὸν σῶμα.

[4] προσαχθήσῃ δὲ τῷ λεγομένῳ.

[5] κἂν βιασάμενος ὁ λόγος εὕρῃ.

Chapter LXXIV.

After this he returns to the subject of Marcion's opinions (having already spoken frequently of them), and states some of them correctly, while others he has misunderstood; these, however, it is not necessary for us to answer or refute. Again, after this he brings forward the various arguments that may be urged on Marcion's behalf, and also against him, enumerating what the opinions are which exonerate him from the charges, and what expose him to them; and when he desires to support the statement which declares that Jesus has been the subject of prophecy,—in order to found a charge against Marcion and his followers,—he distinctly asks, "How could he, who was punished in such a manner, be shown to be God's Son, unless these things had been predicted of him?" He next proceeds to jest, and, as his custom is, to pour ridicule upon the subject, introducing "two sons of God, one the son of the Creator,[1] and the other the son of Marcion's God; and he portrays their single combats, saying that the Theomachies of the Fathers are like the battles between quails;[2] or that the Fathers, becoming useless through age, and falling into their dotage,[3] do not meddle at all with one another, but leave their sons to fight it out." The remark which he made formerly we will turn against himself: "What old woman would not be ashamed to lull a child to sleep with such stories as he has inserted in the work which he entitles *A True Discourse?* For when he ought seriously[4] to apply himself to argument, he leaves serious argument aside, and betakes himself to jesting and buffoonery, imagining that he is writing mimes or scoffing verses; not observing that such a method of procedure defeats his purpose, which is to make us abandon Christianity and give in our adherence to his opinions, which, perhaps, had they been stated with some degree of gravity,[5] would have appeared more likely to convince, whereas, since he continues to ridicule, and scoff, and play the buffoon, we answer that it is because he has no argument of weight[6] (for such he neither had, nor could understand) that he has betaken himself to such drivelling."[7]

[1] τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. [2] ὀρτύγων. [3] ληροῦντας. [4] πραγματικῶς.
[5] ἐσεμνολόγει. [6] σεμνῶν λόγων. [7] τοσαύτην φλυαρίαν

Chapter LXXV.

To the preceding remarks he adds the following: "Since a divine Spirit inhabited the body [of Jesus], it must certainly have been different from that of other beings, in respect of grandeur, or beauty, or strength, or voice, or impressiveness,[1] or persuasiveness. For it is impossible that He, to whom was imparted some divine quality beyond other beings, should not differ from others; whereas this person did not differ in any respect from another, but was, as they report, little, and ill-favoured, and ignoble."[2] Now it is evident by these words, that when Celsus wishes to bring a charge against Jesus, he adduces the sacred writings, as one who believed them to be writings apparently fitted to afford a handle for a charge against Him; but wherever, in the same writings, statements would appear to be made opposed to those charges which are adduced, he pretends not even to know them! There are, indeed, admitted to be recorded some statements respecting the body of Jesus having been "ill-favoured;" not, however, "ignoble," as has been stated, nor is there any certain evidence that he was "little." The language of Isaiah runs as follows, who prophesied regarding Him that He would come and visit the multitude, not in comeliness of form, nor in any surpassing beauty: "Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom was the arm of the Lord revealed? He made announcement before Him, as a child, as a root in a thirsty ground. He has no form nor glory, and we beheld Him, and He had no form nor beauty; but His form was without honour, and inferior to that of the sons of men."[3] These passages, then, Celsus listened to, because he thought they were of use to him in bringing a charge against Jesus; but he paid no attention to the words of the 45th Psalm, and why it is then said, "Gird Thy sword upon Thy thigh, O most mighty, with Thy comeliness and beauty, and continue, and prosper, and reign."[4]

Chapter LXXVI.

Let it be supposed, however, that he had not read the pro-

[1] *κατάπληξιν.*
[2] *ἀγενές.*
[3] Cf. Isa. liii. 1–3 (LXX.).
[4] Cf. Ps. xlv. 3, 4 (LXX.).

phecy, or that he *had* read it, but had been drawn away by those who misinterpreted it as not being spoken of Jesus Christ. What has he to say of the Gospel, in the narratives of which Jesus ascended up into a high mountain, and was transfigured before the disciples, and was seen in glory, when both Moses and Elias, "being seen in glory, spake of the decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem?" or when the prophet says, "We beheld Him, and He had no form nor beauty," etc.? and Celsus accepts this prophecy as referring to Jesus, being blinded in so accepting it, and not seeing that it is a great proof that the Jesus who appeared to be "without form" was the Son of God, that His very appearance should have been made the subject of prophecy many years before His birth. But if another prophet speak of His comeliness and beauty, he will no longer accept the prophecy as referring to Christ! And if it were to be clearly ascertained from the Gospels that "He had no form nor beauty, but that His appearance was without honour, and inferior to that of the sons of men," it might be said that it was not with reference to the prophetic writings, but to the Gospels, that Celsus made his remarks. But now, as neither the Gospels nor the apostolic writings indicate that "He had no form nor beauty," it is evident that we must accept the declaration of the prophets as true of Christ, and this will prevent the charge against Jesus from being advanced.[1]

Chapter lxxvii.

But again, how did he who said, "Since a divine Spirit inhabited the body [of Jesus], it must certainly have been different from that of other beings in respect of grandeur, or voice, or strength, or impressiveness, or persuasiveness," not observe the changing relation of His body according to the capacity of the spectators (and therefore its corresponding utility), inasmuch as it appeared to each one of such a nature as it was requisite for him to behold it? Moreover, it is not a subject of wonder that the matter, which is by nature susceptible of being altered and changed, and of being transformed into anything which the Creator chooses, and is capable of

[1] προβαίνειν.

receiving all the qualities which the Artificer desires, should at one time possess a quality, agreeably to which it is said, "He had no form nor beauty," and at another, one so glorious, and majestic, and marvellous, that the spectators of such surpassing loveliness — three disciples who had ascended [the mount] with Jesus—should fall upon their faces. He will say, however, that these are inventions, and in no respect different from myths, as are also the other marvels related of Jesus; which objection we have answered at greater length in what has gone before. But there is also something mystical in this doctrine, which announces that the varying appearances of Jesus are to be referred to the nature of the divine Word, who does not show Himself in the same manner to the multitude as He does to those who are capable of following Him to the high mountain which we have mentioned; for to those who still remain below, and are not yet prepared to ascend, the Word "has neither form nor beauty," because to such persons His form is "without honour," and inferior to the words given forth by men, which are figuratively termed "sons of men." For we might say that the words of philosophers—who are "sons of men"—appear far more beautiful than the Word of God, who is proclaimed to the multitude, and who also exhibits [what is called] the "foolishness of preaching," and on account of this apparent "foolishness of preaching" those who look at this alone say, "We saw Him, but He had no form nor beauty." To those, indeed, who have received power to follow Him, in order that they may attend Him even when He ascends to the "lofty mount," He *has* a diviner appearance, which they behold, if there happens to be [among them] a Peter, who has received within himself the edifice of the church based upon the Word, and who has gained such a habit [of goodness] that none of the gates of Hades will prevail against him, having been exalted by the Word from the gates of death, that he may "publish the praises of God in the gates of the daughter of Sion," and any others who have derived their birth from impressive preaching,[1] and who are not at all inferior to "sons of thunder." But how can Celsus and the enemies of the divine Word, and those who have not examined

[1] καὶ εἴ τινές εἰσιν ἐκ λόγων τὴν γένεσιν λαχόντες μεγαλοφώνων.

the doctrines of Christianity in the spirit of truth, know the meaning of the different appearances of Jesus? And I refer also to the different stages of His life, and to any actions performed by Him before His sufferings, and after His resurrection from the dead.

Chapter LXXVIII.

Celsus next makes certain observations of the following nature: "Again, if God, like Jupiter in the comedy, should, on awaking from a lengthened slumber, desire to rescue the human race from evil, why did He send this Spirit of which you speak into one corner [of the earth]? He ought to have breathed it alike into many bodies, and have sent them out into all the world. Now the comic poet, to cause laughter in the theatre, wrote that Jupiter, after awakening, despatched Mercury to the Athenians and Lacedæmonians; but do not you think that you have made the Son of God more ridiculous in sending Him to the Jews?" Observe in such language as this the irreverent character of Celsus, who, unlike a philosopher, takes the writer of a comedy, whose business is to cause laughter, and compares our God, the Creator of all things, to the being who, as represented in the play, on awaking, despatches Mercury [on an errand]! We stated, indeed, in what precedes, that it was not as if awakening from a lengthened slumber that God sent Jesus to the human race, who has now, for good reasons, fulfilled the economy of His incarnation, but who has always conferred benefits upon the human race. For no noble deed has ever been performed amongst men, where the divine Word did not visit the souls of those who were capable, although for a little time, of admitting such operations of the divine Word. Moreover, the advent of Jesus apparently to one corner [of the earth] was founded on good reasons, since it was necessary that He who was the subject of prophecy should make His appearance among those who had become acquainted with the doctrine of one God, and who perused the writings of His prophets, and who had come to know the announcement of Christ, and that He should come to them at a time when the Word was about to be diffused from one corner over the whole world.

Chapter lxxix.

And therefore there was no need that there should everywhere exist many bodies, and many spirits like Jesus, in order that the whole world of men might be enlightened by the Word of God. For the one Word was enough, having arisen as the "Sun of righteousness," to send forth from Judea His coming rays into the soul of all who were willing to receive Him. But if any one desires to see many bodies filled with a divine Spirit, similar to the one Christ, ministering to the salvation of men everywhere, let him take note of those who teach the gospel of Jesus in all lands in soundness of doctrine and uprightness of life, and who are themselves termed "christs" by the Holy Scriptures, in the passage, "Touch not mine anointed,[1] and do not my prophets any harm."[2] For as we have heard that Antichrist cometh, and yet have learned that there are many antichrists in the world, in the same way, knowing that Christ has come, we see that, owing to Him, there are many christs in the world, who, like Him, have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore God, the God of Christ, anointed them also with the "oil of gladness." But inasmuch as He loved righteousness and hated iniquity above those who were His partners,[3] He also obtained the first-fruits of His anointing, and, if we must so term it, the entire unction of the oil of gladness; while they who were His partners shared also in His unction, in proportion to their individual capacity. Therefore, since Christ is the head of the church, so that Christ and the church form one body, the ointment descended from the head to the beard of Aaron,—the symbols of the perfect man,—and this ointment in its descent reached to the very skirt of his garment. This is my answer to the irreverent language of Celsus when he says, "He ought to have breathed [His Spirit] alike into many bodies, and have sent it forth into all the world." The comic poet, indeed, to cause laughter, has represented Jupiter asleep and awaking from slumber, and despatching Mercury to the Greeks; but the Word, knowing that the nature of God is unaffected by sleep, may teach us that God administers in

[1] τῶν χριστῶν μου.

[2] Cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 22 and Ps. cv. 15.

[3] τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ.

due season, and as right reason demands, the affairs of the world. It is not, however, a matter of surprise that, owing to the greatness and incomprehensibility[1] of the divine judgments, ignorant persons should make mistakes, and Celsus among them. There is therefore nothing ridiculous in the Son of God having been sent to the Jews, amongst whom the prophets had appeared, in order that, making a commencement among them in a bodily shape, He might arise with might and power upon a world of souls, which no longer desired to remain deserted by God.

Chapter lxxx.

After this, it seemed proper to Celsus to term the Chaldeans a most divinely-inspired nation from the very earliest times,[2] from whom the delusive system of astrology[3] has spread abroad among men. Nay, he ranks the Magi also in the same category, from whom the art of magic derived its name and has been transmitted to other nations, to the corruption and destruction of those who employ it. In the preceding part of this work, [we mentioned] that, in the opinion even of Celsus, the Egyptians also were guilty of error, because they had indeed solemn enclosures around what they considered their temples, while within them there was nothing save apes, or crocodiles, or goats, or asps, or some other animal; but on the present occasion it pleases him to speak of the Egyptian people too as most divinely inspired, and that, too, from the earliest times,—perhaps because they made war upon the Jews from an early date. The Persians, moreover, who marry their own mothers, and have intercourse with their own daughters, are, in the opinion of Celsus, an inspired race; nay, even the Indians are so, some of whom, in the preceding, he mentioned as eaters of human flesh. To the Jews, however, especially those of ancient times, who employ none of these practices, he did not merely refuse the name of inspired, but declared that they would immediately perish. And this prediction he uttered respecting them, as being doubtless endued with prophetic power, not observing that the whole history of the Jews, and their ancient and venerable polity, were administered by God; and that it is by their

[1] δυσδιηγήτους τὰς κρίσεις. [2] ἐξ ἀρχῆς. [3] γενεθλιαλογία.

fall that salvation has come to the Gentiles, and that "their fall is the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles,"[1] until the fulness of the Gentiles come, that after that the whole of Israel, whom Celsus does not know, may be saved.

Chapter lxxxi.

I do not understand, however, how he should say of God, that although "knowing all things, He was not aware of this, that He was sending His Son amongst wicked men, who were both to be guilty of sin, and to inflict punishment upon Him." Certainly he appears, in the present instance, to have forgotten that all the sufferings which Jesus was to undergo were foreseen by the Spirit of God, and foretold by His prophets; from which it does not follow that "God did not know that He was sending His Son amongst wicked and sinful men, who were also to inflict punishment upon Him." He immediately adds, however, that "our defence on this point is that all these things were predicted." But as our sixth book has now attained sufficient dimensions, we shall stop here, and begin, God willing, the argument of the seventh, in which we shall consider the reasons which he thinks furnish an answer to our statement, that everything regarding Jesus was foretold by the prophets; and as these are numerous, and require to be answered at length, we wished neither to cut the subject short, in consequence of the size of the present book, nor, in order to avoid doing so, to swell this sixth book beyond its proper proportions.

[1] Cf. Rom. xi. 11, 12.

BOOK VII.

Chapter I.

N the six former books we have endeavoured, reverend brother Ambrosius, according to our ability to meet the charges brought by Celsus against the Christians, and have as far as possible passed over nothing without first subjecting it to a full and close examination. And now, while we enter upon the seventh book, we call upon God through Jesus Christ, whom Celsus accuses, that He who is the truth of God would shed light into our hearts and scatter the darkness of error, in accordance with that saying of the prophet which we now offer as our prayer, "Destroy them by Thy truth."[1] For it is evidently the words and reasonings opposed to the truth that God destroys by His truth; so that when these are destroyed, all who are delivered from deception may go on with the prophet to say, "I will freely sacrifice unto Thee,"[2] and may offer to the Most High a reasonable and smokeless sacrifice.

Chapter II.

Celsus now sets himself to combat the views of those who say that the Jewish prophets foretold events which happened in the life of Christ Jesus. At the outset let us refer to a notion he has, that those who assume the existence of another God besides the God of the Jews have no ground on which to answer his objections; while we who recognise the same God rely for our defence on the prophecies which were delivered concerning Jesus Christ. His words are: "Let us see how they can raise a defence. To those who admit another God, no defence is possible; and they who recognise the same God will always fall back upon the same reason, 'This and that must have

[1] Ps. liv. 5. [2] Ps. liv. 6.

happened.' And why? 'Because it had been predicted long before.'" To this we answer, that the arguments recently raised by Celsus against Jesus and Christians were so utterly feeble, that they might easily be overthrown even by those who are impious enough to bring in another God. Indeed, were it not dangerous to give to the weak any excuse for embracing false notions, we could furnish the answer ourselves, and show Celsus how unfounded is his opinion, that those who admit another God are not in a position to meet his arguments. However, let us for the present confine ourselves to a defence of the prophets, in continuation of what we have said on the subject before.

Chapter III.

Celsus goes on to say of us: "They set no value on the oracles of the Pythian priestess, of the priests of Dodona, of Clarus, of Branchidæ, of Jupiter Ammon, and of a multitude of others; although under their guidance we may say that colonies were sent forth, and the whole world peopled. But those sayings which were uttered or not uttered in Judea, after the manner of that country, as indeed they are still delivered among the people of Phœnicia and Palestine—these they look upon as marvellous sayings, and unchangeably true." In regard to the oracles here enumerated, we reply that it would be possible for us to gather from the writings of Aristotle and the Peripatetic school not a few things to overthrow the authority of the Pythian and the other oracles. From Epicurus also, and his followers, we could quote passages to show that even among the Greeks themselves there were some who utterly discredited the oracles which were recognised and admired throughout the whole of Greece. But let it be granted that the responses delivered by the Pythian and other oracles were not the utterances of false men who pretended to a divine inspiration; and let us see if, after all, we cannot convince any sincere inquirers that there is no necessity to attribute these oracular responses to any divinities, but that, on the other hand, they may be traced to wicked demons—to spirits which are at enmity with the human race, and which in this way wish to hinder the soul from rising upwards, from following the path of virtue, and

from returning to God in sincere piety. It is said of the Pythian priestess, whose oracle seems to have been the most celebrated, that when she sat down at the mouth of the Castalian cave, the prophetic spirit of Apollo entered her private parts; and when she was filled with it, she gave utterance to responses which are regarded with awe as divine truths. Judge by this whether that spirit does not show its profane and impure nature, by choosing to enter the soul of the prophetess not through the more becoming medium of the bodily pores which are both open and invisible, but by means of what no modest man would ever see or speak of. And this occurs not once or twice, which would be more permissible, but as often as she was believed to receive inspiration from Apollo. Moreover, it is not the part of a divine spirit to drive the prophetess into such a state of ecstasy and madness that she loses control of herself. For he who is under the influence of the Divine Spirit ought to be the first to receive the beneficial effects; and these ought not to be first enjoyed by the persons who consult the oracle about the concerns of natural or civil life, or for purposes of temporal gain or interest; and, moreover, that should be the time of clearest perception, when a person is in close intercourse with the Deity.

Chapter IV.

Accordingly, we can show from an examination of the sacred Scriptures, that the Jewish prophets, who were enlightened as far as was necessary for their prophetic work by the Spirit of God, were the first to enjoy the benefit of the inspiration; and by the contact—if I may so say—of the Holy Spirit they became clearer in mind, and their souls were filled with a brighter light. And the body no longer served as a hindrance to a virtuous life; for to that which we call "the lust of the flesh" it was deadened. For we are persuaded that the Divine Spirit "mortifies the deeds of the body," and destroys that enmity against God which the carnal passions serve to excite. If, then, the Pythian priestess is beside herself when she prophesies, what spirit must that be which fills her mind and clouds her judgment with darkness, unless it be of the same order with those demons which many Christians cast out of persons

possessed with them? And this, we may observe, they do without the use of any curious arts of magic, or incantations, but merely by prayer and simple adjurations which the plainest person can use. Because for the most part it is unlettered persons who perform this work; thus making manifest the grace which is in the word of Christ, and the despicable weakness of demons, which, in order to be overcome and driven out of the bodies and souls of men, do not require the power and wisdom of those who are mighty in argument, and most learned in matters of faith.

Chapter V.

Moreover, if it is believed not only among Christians and Jews, but also by many others among the Greeks and barbarians, that the human soul lives and subsists after its separation from the body; and if reason supports the idea that pure souls which are not weighed down with sin as with a weight of lead ascend on high to the region of purer and more etherial bodies, leaving here below their grosser bodies along with their impurities; whereas souls that are polluted and dragged down to the earth by their sins, so that they are unable even to breathe upwards, wander hither and thither, at some times about sepulchres, where they appear as the apparitions of shadowy spirits, at others among other objects on the ground;—if this is so, what are we to think of those spirits that are attached for entire ages, as I may say, to particular dwellings and places, whether by a sort of magical force or by their own natural wickedness? Are we not compelled by reason to set down as evil such spirits as employ the power of prophesying—a power in itself neither good nor bad—for the purpose of deceiving men, and thus turn them away from God, and from the purity of His service? It is moreover evident that this is their character, when we add that they delight in the blood of victims, and in the smoke and odour of sacrifices, and that they feed their bodies on these, and that they take pleasure in such haunts as these, as though they sought in them the sustenance of their lives; in this resembling those depraved men who despise the purity of a life apart from the senses, and who have no inclination except for the pleasures of the body, and for that earthly and bodily life in

which these pleasures are found. If the Delphian Apollo were a god, as the Greeks suppose, would he not rather have chosen as his prophet some wise man? or if such an one was not to be found, then one who was endeavouring to become wise? How came he not to prefer a man to a woman for the utterance of his prophecies? And if he preferred the latter sex, as though he could only find pleasure in the breast of a woman, why did he not choose among women a virgin to interpret his will?

Chapter VI.

But no; the Pythian, so much admired among the Greeks, judged no wise man, nay, no man at all, worthy of the divine possession, as they call it. And among women he did not choose a virgin, or one recommended by her wisdom, or by her attainments in philosophy; but he selects a common woman. Perhaps the better class of men were too good to become the subjects of the inspiration. Besides, if he were a god, he should have employed his prophetic power as a bait, so to speak, with which he might draw men to a change of life, and to the practice of virtue. But history nowhere makes mention of anything of the kind. For if the oracle did call Socrates the wisest of all men, it takes from the value of that eulogy by what is said in regard to Euripides and Sophocles. The words are:

> "Sophocles is wise, and Euripides is wiser,
> But wiser than all men is Socrates."[1]

As, then, he gives the designation "wise" to the tragic poets, it is not on account of his philosophy that he holds up Socrates to veneration, or because of his love of truth and virtue. It is poor praise of Socrates to say that he prefers him to men who for a paltry reward compete upon the stage, and who by their representations excite the spectators at one time to tears and grief, and at another to unseemly laughter (for such is the intention of the satiric drama). And perhaps it was not so much in regard to his philosophy that he called Socrates the wisest of all men, as on account of the victims which he sacrificed to him and the other demons. For it seems that the demons pay more regard in distributing their favours to the sacrifices which are offered them than to deeds of virtue. Accordingly,

[1] Suidas in Σοφός.

Homer, the best of the poets, who describes what usually took place, when, wishing to show us what most influenced the demons to grant an answer to the wishes of their votaries, introduces Chryses, who, for a few garlands and the thighs of bulls and goats, obtained an answer to his prayers for his daughter Chryseis, so that the Greeks were driven by a pestilence to restore her back to him. And I remember reading in the book of a certain Pythagorean, when writing on the hidden meanings in that poet, that the prayer of Chryses to Apollo, and the plague which Apollo afterwards sent upon the Greeks, are proofs that Homer knew of certain evil demons who delight in the smoke of sacrifices, and who, to reward those who offer them, grant in answer to their prayers the destruction of others. "He," that is, Jupiter, "who rules over wintry Dodona, where his prophets have ever unwashed feet, and sleep upon the ground,"[1] has rejected the male sex, and, as Celsus observes, employs the women of Dodona for the prophetic office. Granting that there are oracles similar to these, as that at Clarus, another in Branchidæ, another in the temple of Jupiter Ammon, or anywhere else; yet how shall it be proved that these are gods, and not demons?

Chapter vii.

In regard to the prophets among the Jews, some of them were wise men before they became divinely inspired prophets, while others became wise by the illumination which their minds received when divinely inspired. They were selected by Divine Providence to receive the Divine Spirit, and to be the depositaries of His holy oracles, on the ground of their leading a life of almost unapproachable excellence, intrepid, noble, unmoved by danger or death. For reason teaches that such ought to be the character of the prophets of the Most High, in comparison with which the firmness of Antisthenes, Crates, and Diogenes will seem but as child's play. It was therefore for their firm adherence to truth, and their faithfulness in the reproof of the wicked, that they were "stoned; they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute,

[1] Homer, *Iliad*, xvi. 234, etc.

afflicted, tormented; they wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth, of whom the world was not worthy:"[1] for they looked always to God and to His blessings, which, being invisible, and not to be perceived by the senses, are eternal. We have the history of the life of each of the prophets; but it will be enough at present to direct attention to the life of Moses, whose prophecies are contained in the law; to that of Jeremiah, as it is given in the book which bears his name; to that of Isaiah, who with unexampled austerity walked naked and barefooted for the space of three years. Read and consider the severe life of those children, Daniel and his companions, how they abstained from flesh, and lived on water and pulse. Or if you will go back to more remote times, think of the life of Noah, who prophesied; and of Isaac, who gave his son a prophetic blessing; or of Jacob, who addressed each of his twelve sons, beginning with "Come, that I may tell you what shall befall you in the last days." These, and a multitude of others, prophesying on behalf of God, foretold events relating to Jesus Christ. We therefore for this reason set at nought the oracles of the Pythian priestess, or those delivered at Dodona, at Clarus, at Branchidæ, at the temple of Jupiter Ammon, or by a multitude of other so-called prophets; whilst we regard with reverent awe the Jewish prophets: for we see that the noble, earnest, and devout lives of these men were worthy of the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, whose wonderful effects were widely different from the divination of demons.

Chapter viii.

I do not know what led Celsus, when saying, "But what things were spoken or not spoken in the land of Judea, according to the custom of the country," to use the words "or not spoken," as though implying that he was incredulous, and that he suspected that those things which were written were never spoken. In fact, he is unacquainted with these times; and he does not know that those prophets who foretold the coming of Christ, predicted a multitude of other events many years beforehand. He adds, with the view of casting a slight upon the ancient prophets, that "they prophesied in the same way

[1] Heb. xi. 37, 38.

as we find them still doing among the inhabitants of Phœnicia and Palestine." But he does not tell us whether he refers to persons who are of different principles from those of the Jews and Christians, or to persons whose prophecies are of the same character as those of the Jewish prophets. However it be, his statement is false, taken in either way. For never have any of those who have not embraced our faith done anything approaching to what was done by the ancient prophets; and in more recent times, since the coming of Christ, no prophets have arisen among the Jews, who have confessedly been abandoned by the Holy Spirit on account of their impiety towards God, and towards Him of whom their prophets spoke. Moreover, the Holy Spirit gave signs of His presence at the beginning of Christ's ministry, and after His ascension He gave still more; but since that time these signs have diminished, although there are still traces of His presence in a few who have had their souls purified by the gospel, and their actions regulated by its influence. "For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding."[1]

Chapter ix.

But as Celsus promises to give an account of the manner in which prophecies are delivered in Phœnicia and Palestine, speaking as though it were a matter with which he had a full and personal acquaintance, let us see what he has to say on the subject. First he lays it down that there are several kinds of prophecies, but he does not specify what they are; indeed, he could not do so, and the statement is a piece of pure ostentation. However, let us see what he considers the most perfect kind of prophecy among these nations. "There are many," he says, "who, although of no name, with the greatest facility and on the slightest occasion, whether within or without temples, assume the motions and gestures of inspired persons; while others do it in cities or among armies, for the purpose of attracting attention and exciting surprise. These are accustomed to say, each for himself, 'I am God; I am the Son of God; or, I am the Divine Spirit; I have come because the world

[1] Wisd. of Sol. i. 5.

is perishing, and you, O men, are perishing for your iniquities. But I wish to save you, and you shall see me returning again with heavenly power. Blessed is he who now does me homage. On all the rest I will send down eternal fire, both on cities and on countries. And those who know not the punishments which await them shall repent and grieve in vain; while those who are faithful to me I will preserve eternally.'" Then he goes on to say: "To these promises are added strange, fanatical, and quite unintelligible words, of which no rational person can find the meaning: for so dark are they, as to have no meaning at all; but they give occasion to every fool or impostor to apply them to suit his own purposes."

Chapter X.

But if he were dealing honestly in his accusations, he ought to have given the exact terms of the prophecies, whether those in which the speaker is introduced as claiming to be God Almighty, or those in which the Son of God speaks, or finally those under the name of the Holy Spirit. For thus he might have endeavoured to overthrow these assertions, and have shown that there was no divine inspiration in those words which urged men to forsake their sins, which condemned the past and foretold the future. For the prophecies were recorded and preserved by men living at the time, that those who came after might read and admire them as the oracles of God, and that they might profit not only by the warnings and admonitions, but also by the predictions, which being shown by events to have proceeded from the Spirit of God, bind men to the practice of piety as set forth in the law and the prophets. The prophets have therefore, as God commanded them, declared with all plainness those things which it was desirable that the hearers should understand at once for the regulation of their conduct; while in regard to deeper and more mysterious subjects, which lay beyond the reach of the common understanding, they set them forth in the form of enigmas and allegories, or of what are called dark sayings, parables, or similitudes. And this plan they have followed, that those who are ready to shun no labour and spare no pains in their endeavours after truth and virtue might search into their meaning, and having found it, might apply it as reason

requires. But Celsus, ever vigorous in his denunciations, as though he were angry at his inability to understand the language of the prophets, scoffs at them thus: "To these grand promises are added strange, fanatical, and quite unintelligible words, of which no rational person can find the meaning; for so dark are they as to have no meaning at all; but they give occasion to every fool or impostor to apply them so as to suit his own purposes." This statement of Celsus seems ingeniously designed to dissuade readers from attempting any inquiry or careful search into their meaning. And in this he is not unlike certain persons, who said to a man whom a prophet had visited to announce future events, "Wherefore came this mad fellow to thee?"[1]

Chapter XI.

I am convinced, indeed, that much better arguments could be adduced than any I have been able to bring forward, to show the falsehood of these allegations of Celsus, and to set forth the divine inspiration of the prophecies; but we have according to our ability, in our commentaries on Isaiah, Ezekiel, and some of the twelve minor prophets, explained literally and in detail what he calls "those fanatical and utterly unintelligible passages." And if God give us grace in the time that He appoints for us, to advance in the knowledge of His word, we shall continue our investigation into the parts which remain, or into such at least as we are able to make plain. And other persons of intelligence who wish to study Scripture may also find out its meaning for themselves; for although there are many places in which the meaning is not obvious, yet there are none where, as Celsus affirms, "there is no sense at all." Neither is it true that "any fool or impostor can explain the passages so as to make them suit his own purposes." For it belongs only to those who are wise in the truth of Christ (and to all them it does belong) to unfold the connection and meaning of even the obscure parts of prophecy, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," and interpreting each passage according to the usage of Scripture writers. And Celsus is not to be believed when he says that he has heard such men prophesy:

[1] 2 Kings ix. 11.

for no prophets bearing any resemblance to the ancient prophets have appeared in the time of Celsus. If there had been any, those who heard and admired them would have followed the example of the ancients, and have recorded the prophecies in writing. And it seems quite clear that Celsus is speaking falsely, when he says that "those prophets whom he had heard, on being pressed by him, confessed their true motives, and acknowledged that the ambiguous words they used really meant nothing." He ought to have given the names of those whom he says he had heard, if he had any to give, so that those who were competent to judge might decide whether his allegations were true or false.

Chapter XII.

He thinks, besides, that those who support the cause of Christ by a reference to the writings of the prophets can give no proper answer in regard to statements in them which attribute to God that which is wicked, shameful, or impure; and assuming that no answer can be given, he proceeds to draw a whole train of inferences, none of which can be allowed. But he ought to know that those who wish to live according to the teaching of sacred Scripture understand the saying, "The knowledge of the unwise is as talk without sense,"[1] and have learnt "to be ready always to give an answer to every one that asketh us a reason for the hope that is in us."[2] And they are not satisfied with affirming that such and such things have been predicted; but they endeavour to remove any apparent inconsistencies, and to show that, so far from there being anything evil, shameful, or impure in these predictions, everything is worthy of being received by those who understand the sacred Scriptures. But Celsus ought to have adduced from the prophets examples of what he thought bad, or shameful, or impure, if he saw any such passages; for then his argument would have had much more force, and would have furthered his purpose much better. He gives no instances, however, but contents himself with loudly asserting the false charge that these things are to be found in Scripture. There is no reason, then, for us to defend ourselves against groundless charges, which

[1] Ecclus. xxi. 18. [2] 1 Pet. iii. 15.

are but empty sounds, or to take the trouble of showing that in the writings of the prophets there is nothing evil, shameful, impure, or abominable.

Chapter xiii.

And there is no truth in the statement of Celsus, that "God does the most shameless deeds, or suffers the most shameless sufferings," or that "He favours the commission of evil;" for whatever he may say, no such things have ever been foretold. He ought to have cited from the prophets the passages in which God is represented as favouring evil, or as doing and enduring the most shameless deeds, and not have sought without foundation to prejudice the minds of his readers. The prophets, indeed, foretold what Christ should suffer, and set forth the reason why He should suffer. God therefore also knew what Christ would suffer; but where has he learnt that those things which the Christ of God should suffer were most base and dishonourable? He goes on to explain what those most shameful and degrading things were which Christ suffered, in these words: "For what better was it for God to eat the flesh of sheep, or to drink vinegar and gall, than to feed on filth?" But God, according to us, did not eat the flesh of sheep; and while it may seem that Jesus ate, He did so only as possessing a body. But in regard to the vinegar and gall mentioned in the prophecy, "They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,"[1] we have already referred[2] to this point; and as Celsus compels us to recur to it again, we would only say further, that those who resist the word of truth do ever offer to Christ the Son of God the gall of their own wickedness, and the vinegar of their evil inclinations; but though He tastes of it, yet He will not drink it.

Chapter xiv.

In the next place, wishing to shake the faith of those who believe in Jesus on the ground of the prophecies which were delivered in regard to Him, Celsus says: "But pray, if the prophets foretold that the great God — not to put it more harshly—would become a slave, or become sick, or die; would

[1] Ps. lxix. 21. [2] Book ii. chap. 37.

there be therefore any necessity that God should die, or suffer sickness, or become a slave, simply because such things had been foretold? Must he die in order to prove his divinity? But the prophets never would utter predictions so wicked and impious. We need not therefore inquire whether a thing has been predicted or not, but whether the thing is honourable in itself, and worthy of God. In that which is evil and base, although it seemed that all men in the world had foretold it in a fit of madness, we must not believe. How then can the pious mind admit that those things which are said to have happened to him, could have happened to one who is God?" From this it is plain that Celsus feels the argument from prophecy to be very effective for convincing those to whom Christ is preached; but he seems to endeavour to overthrow it by an opposite probability, namely, "that the question is not whether the prophets uttered these predictions or not." But if he wished to reason justly and without evasion, he ought rather to have said, "We must show that these things were never predicted, or that those things which were predicted of Christ have never been fulfilled in him," and in that way he would have established the position which he holds. In that way it would have been made plain what those prophecies are which we apply to Jesus, and how Celsus could justify himself in asserting that that application was false. And we should thus have seen whether he fairly disproved all that we bring from the prophets in behalf of Jesus, or whether he is himself convicted of a shameless endeavour to resist the plainest truths by violent assertions.

Chapter XV.

After assuming that some things were foretold which are impossible in themselves, and inconsistent with the character of God, he says: "If these things were predicted of the Most High God, are we bound to believe them of God simply because they were predicted?" And thus he thinks he proves, that although the prophets may have foretold truly such things of the Son of God, yet it is impossible for us to believe in those prophecies declaring that He would do or suffer such things. To this our answer is that the supposition is absurd, for it combines two lines of reasoning which are opposed to each other, and

therefore mutually destructive. This may be shown as follows. The one argument is: "If any true prophets of the Most High say that God will become a slave, or suffer sickness, or die, these things will come to God; for it is impossible that the prophets of the great God should utter lies." The other is: "If even true prophets of the Most High God say that these same things shall come to pass, seeing that these things foretold are by the nature of things impossible, the prophecies are not true, and therefore those things which have been foretold will not happen to God." When, then, we find two processes of reasoning in both of which the major premiss is the same, leading to two contradictory conclusions, we use the form of argument called "the theorem of two propositions,"[1] to prove that the major premiss is false, which in the case before us is this, "that the prophets have foretold that the great God should become a slave, suffer sickness, or die." We conclude, then, that the prophets never foretold such things; and the argument is formally expressed as follows: 1*st*, Of two things, if the first is true, the second is true; 2*d*, if the first is[2] true, the second is not true, therefore the first is not true. The concrete example which the Stoics give to illustrate this form of argument is the following: 1*st*, If you know that you are dead, you are dead; 2*d*, if you know that you are dead, you are not dead. And the conclusion is—"you do not know that you are dead." These propositions are worked out as follows: If you know that you are dead, that which you know is certain; therefore you are dead. Again, if you know that you are dead, your death is an object of knowledge; but as the dead know nothing, your knowing this proves that you are not dead. Accordingly, by joining the two arguments together, you arrive at the conclusion—"you do not know that you are dead." Now the hypothesis of Celsus which we have given above is much of the same kind.

Chapter xvi.

But besides, the prophecies which he introduces into his argu-

[1] διὰ δύο τροπικῶν θεωρήμα.

[2] We follow Bouhereau and Valesius, who expunge the negative particle in this clause.

ment are very different from what the prophets actually foretold of Jesus Christ. For the prophecies do not foretell that God will be crucified, when they say of Him who should suffer, "We beheld Him, and He had no form or comeliness; but His form was dishonoured and marred more than the sons of men; He was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief."[1] Observe, then, how distinctly they say that it was a man who should endure these human sufferings. And Jesus Himself, who knew perfectly that one who was to die must be a man, said to His accusers: "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath spoken unto you the truth which I heard of God."[2] And if in that man as He appeared among men there was something divine, namely the only-begotten Son of God, the first-born of all creation, one who said of Himself, "I am the truth," "I am the life," "I am the door," "I am the way," "I am the living bread which came down from heaven," of this Being and His nature we must judge and reason in a way quite different from that in which we judge of the man who was seen in Jesus Christ. Accordingly, you will find no Christian, however simple he may be, and however little versed in critical studies, who would say that He who died was "the truth," "the life," "the way," "the living bread which came down from heaven," "the resurrection;" for it was He who appeared to us in the form of the man Jesus, who taught us, saying, "I am the resurrection." There is no one amongst us, I say, so extravagant as to affirm "the Life died," "the Resurrection died." The supposition of Celsus would have some foundation if we were to say that it had been foretold by the prophets that death would befall God the Word, the Truth, the Life, the Resurrection, or any other name which is assumed by the Son of God.

Chapter xvii.

In one point alone is Celsus correct in his statements on this subject. It is that in which he says: "The prophets would not foretell this, because it involves that which is wicked and impious,"—namely, that the great God should become a slave or suffer death. But that which is predicted by the prophets is worthy of God, that He who is the brightness and express

[1] Isa. liii. 2, 3. [2] John viii. 40.

image of the divine nature should come into the world with the holy human soul which was to animate the body of Jesus, to sow the seed of His word, which might bring all who received and cherished it into union with the Most High God, and which would lead to perfect blessedness all those who felt within them the power of God the Word, who was to be in the body and soul of a man. He was to be in it indeed, but not in such a way as to confine therein all the rays of His glory; and we are not to suppose that the light of Him who is God the Word is shed forth in no other way than in this. If, then, we consider Jesus in relation to the divinity that was in Him, the things which He did in this capacity present nothing to offend our ideas of God, nothing but what is holy; and if we consider Him as man, distinguished beyond all other men by an intimate communion with the Eternal Word, with absolute Wisdom, He suffered as one who was wise and perfect, whatever it behoved Him to suffer who did all for the good of the human race, yea, even for the good of all intelligent beings. And there is nothing absurd in a man having died, and in His death being not only an example of death endured for the sake of piety, but also the first blow in the conflict which is to overthrow the power of that evil spirit the devil, who had obtained dominion over the whole world. For we have signs and pledges of the destruction of his empire, in those who through the coming of Christ are everywhere escaping from the power of demons, and who, after their deliverance from this bondage in which they were held, consecrate themselves to God, and earnestly devote themselves day by day to advancement in a life of piety.

Chapter xviii.

Celsus adds: "Will they not besides make this reflection? If the prophets of the God of the Jews foretold that he who should come into the world would be the Son of this same God, how could he command them through Moses to gather wealth, to extend their dominion, to fill the earth, to put their enemies of every age to the sword, and to destroy them utterly, which indeed he himself did—as Moses says—threatening them, moreover, that if they did not obey his commands, he would treat them as his avowed enemies; whilst, on the other hand,

his Son, the man of Nazareth, promulgated laws quite opposed to these, declaring that no one can come to the Father who loves power, or riches, or glory; that men ought not to be more careful in providing food than the ravens; that they were to be less concerned about their raiment than the lilies; that to him who has given them one blow, they should offer to receive another? Whether is it Moses or Jesus who teaches falsely? Did the Father, when he sent Jesus, forget the commands which he had given to Moses? Or did he change his mind, condemn his own laws, and send forth a messenger with counter instructions?" Celsus, with all his boasts of universal knowledge, has here fallen into the most vulgar of errors, in supposing that in the law and the prophets there is not a meaning deeper than that afforded by a literal rendering of the words. He does not see how manifestly incredible it is that worldly riches should be promised to those who lead upright lives, when it is a matter of common observation that the best of men have lived in extreme poverty. Indeed, the prophets themselves, who for the purity of their lives received the Divine Spirit, "wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented: they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth."[1] For, as the Psalmist says, "many are the afflictions of the righteous."[2] If Celsus had read the writings of Moses, he would, I daresay, have supposed that when it is said to him who kept the law, "Thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou thyself shalt not borrow,"[3] the promise is made to the just man, that his temporal riches should be so abundant, that he would be able to lend not only to the Jews, not only to two or three nations, but "to many nations." What, then, must have been the wealth which the just man received according to the law for his righteousness, if he could lend to many nations? And must we not suppose also, in accordance with this interpretation, that the just man would never borrow anything? For it is written, "and thou shalt thyself borrow nothing." Did then that nation remain for so long a period attached to the religion which was taught by Moses, whilst, according to the supposition of Celsus, they saw themselves so grievously deceived by

[1] Heb. xi. 37, 38. [2] Ps. xxxiv. 19. [3] Deut. xxviii. 12.

that lawgiver? For nowhere is it said of any one that he was so rich as to lend to many nations. It is not to be believed that they would have fought so zealously in defence of a law whose promises had proved glaringly false, if they understood them in the sense which Celsus gives to them. And if any one should say that the sins which are recorded to have been committed by the people are a proof that they despised the law, doubtless from the feeling that they had been deceived by it, we may reply that we have only to read the history of the times in order to find it shown that the whole people, after having done that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, returned afterwards to their duty, and to the religion prescribed by the law.

Chapter xix.

Now if these words in the law, "Thou shalt have dominion over many nations, and no one shall rule over thee," were simply a promise to them of dominion, and if they contain no deeper meaning than this, then it is certain that the people would have had still stronger grounds for despising the promises of the law. Celsus brings forward another passage, although he changes the terms of it, where it is said that the whole earth shall be filled with the Hebrew race; which indeed, according to the testimony of history, did actually happen after the coming of Christ, although rather as a result of God's anger, if I may so say, than of His blessing. As to the promise made to the Jews that they should slay their enemies, it may be answered that any one who examines carefully into the meaning of this passage will find himself unable to interpret it literally. It is sufficient at present to refer to the manner in which in the Psalms the just man is represented as saying, among other things, "Every morning will I destroy the wicked of the land, that I may cut off all workers of iniquity from the city of Jehovah."[1] Judge, then, from the words and spirit of the speaker, whether it is conceivable that, after having in the preceding part of the Psalm, as any one may read for himself, uttered the noblest thoughts and purposes, he should in the sequel, according to the literal rendering of his words,

[1] Ps. ci. 9.

say that in the morning, and at no other period of the day, he would destroy all sinners from the earth, and leave none of them alive, and that he would slay every one in Jerusalem who did iniquity. And there are many similar expressions to be found in the law, as this, for example: "We left not anything alive."[1]

Chapter xx.

Celsus adds, that it was foretold to the Jews, that if they did not obey the law, they would be treated in the same way as they treated their enemies; and then he quotes from the teaching of Christ some precepts which he considers contrary to those of the law, and uses that as an argument against us. But before proceeding to this point, we must speak of that which precedes. We hold, then, that the law has a twofold sense, — the one literal, the other spiritual, — as has been shown by some before us. Of the first or literal sense it is said, not by us, but by God, speaking in one of the prophets, that "the statutes are not good, and the judgments not good;"[2] whereas, taken in a spiritual sense, the same prophet makes God say that "His statutes are good, and His judgments good." Yet evidently the prophet is not saying things which are contradictory of each other. Paul in like manner says, that "the letter killeth, and the spirit giveth life,"[3] meaning by "the letter" the literal sense, and by "the spirit" the spiritual sense of Scripture. We may therefore find in Paul, as well as in the prophet, apparent contradictions. Indeed, if Ezekiel says in one place, "I gave them commandments which were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live," and in another, "I gave them good commandments and judgments, which if a man shall do, he shall live by them," Paul in like manner, when he wishes to disparage the law taken literally, says, "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"[4] But

[1] Deut. ii. 34.
[2] Ezek. xx. 25.
[3] 2 Cor. iii. 6.
[4] 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8.

when in another place he wishes to praise and recommend the law, he calls it "spiritual," and says, "We know that the law is spiritual;" and, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."[1]

Chapter xxi.

When, then, the letter of the law promises riches to the just, Celsus may follow the letter which killeth, and understand it of worldly riches, which blind men; but we say that it refers to those riches which enlighten the eyes, and which enrich a man "in all utterance and in all knowledge." And in this sense we "charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate."[2] For, as Solomon says, "riches" are the true good, which "are the ransom of the life of a man;" but the poverty which is the opposite of these riches is destructive, for by it "the poor cannot bear rebuke."[3] And what has been said of riches applies to dominion, in regard to which it is said, "The just man shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight."[4] Now if riches are to be taken in the sense we have just explained, consider if it is not according to God's promise that he who is rich in all utterance, in all knowledge, in all wisdom, in all good works, may not out of these treasures of utterance, of wisdom, and of knowledge, lend to many nations. It was thus that Paul lent to all the nations that he visited, "carrying the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum."[5] And as the divine knowledge was given to him by revelation, and his mind was illumined by the Divine Word, he himself therefore needed to borrow from no one, and required not the ministry of any man to teach him the word of truth. Thus, as it had been written, "Thou shalt have dominion over many nations, and they shall not have dominion over thee," he ruled over the Gentiles whom he brought under the teaching of Jesus Christ; and he never "gave place by subjection to men,

[1] Rom. vii. 12, 14. [2] 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18. [3] Prov. xiii. 8.
[4] Deut. xxxii. 30. [5] Rom. xv. 19.

no, not for an hour,"[1] as being himself mightier than they. And thus also he "filled the earth."

Chapter xxii.

If I must now explain how the just man "slays his enemies," and prevails everywhere, it is to be observed that, when he says, "Every morning will I destroy the wicked of the land, that I may cut off all workers of iniquity from the city of Jehovah," by "the land" he means the flesh whose lusts are at enmity with God; and by "the city of Jehovah" he designates his own soul, in which was the temple of God, containing the true idea and conception of God, which makes it to be admired by all who look upon it. As soon, then, as the rays of the Sun of righteousness shine into his soul, feeling strengthened and invigorated by their influence, he sets himself to destroy all the lusts of the flesh, which are called "the wicked of the land," and drives out of that city of the Lord which is in his soul all thoughts which work iniquity, and all suggestions which are opposed to the truth. And in this way also the just give up to destruction all their enemies, which are their vices, so that they do not spare even the children, that is, the early beginnings and promptings of evil. In this sense also we understand the language of the 137th Psalm: "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us: happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."[2] For "the little ones" of Babylon (which signifies confusion) are those troublesome sinful thoughts which arise in the soul; and he who subdues them by striking, as it were, their heads against the firm and solid strength of reason and truth, is the man who "dasheth the little ones against the stones;" and he is therefore truly blessed. God may therefore have commanded men to destroy all their vices utterly, even at their birth, without having enjoined anything contrary to the teaching of Christ; and He may Himself have destroyed before the eyes of those who were "Jews inwardly"[3] all the offspring of evil as His enemies. And, in like manner, those who disobey the law and word of God may well be compared to His enemies led astray

[1] Gal. ii. 5. [2] Ps. cxxxvii. 8, 9. [3] Rom. ii. 29.

by sin; and they may well be said to suffer the same fate as they deserve who have proved traitors to the truth of God.

Chapter xxiii.

From what has been said, it is clear then that Jesus, "the man of Nazareth," did not promulgate laws opposed to those just considered in regard to riches, when He said, "It is hard for the rich man to enter into the kingdom of God;"[1] whether we take the word "rich" in its simplest sense, as referring to the man whose mind is distracted by his wealth, and, as it were, entangled with thorns, so that he brings forth no spiritual fruit; or whether it is the man who is rich in the sense of abounding in false notions, of whom it is written in the Proverbs, "Better is the poor man who is just, than the rich man who is false."[2] Perhaps it is the following passages which have led Celsus to suppose that Jesus forbids ambition to His disciples: "Whoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all;"[3] "The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them,"[4] and "they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors."[5] But there is nothing here inconsistent with the promise, "Thou shalt rule over many nations, and they shall not rule over thee," especially after the explanation which we have given of these words. Celsus next throws in an expression in regard to wisdom, as though he thought that, according to the teaching of Christ, no wise man could come to the Father. But we would ask in what sense he speaks of a wise man. For if he means one who is wise in "the wisdom of this world," as it is called, "which is foolishness with God,"[6] then we would agree with him in saying that access to the Father is denied to one who is wise in that sense. But if by wisdom any one means Christ, who is "the power and wisdom of God," far from such a wise man being refused access to the Father, we hold that he who is adorned by the Holy Spirit with that gift which is called "the word of wisdom," far excels all those who have not received the same grace.

[1] Matt. xix. 23. [2] Prov. xxviii. 6. [3] Mark x. 44.
[4] Matt. xx. 25. [5] Luke xxii. 25. [6] 1 Cor. iii. 19.

Chapter xxiv.

The pursuit of human glory, we maintain, is forbidden not only by the teaching of Jesus, but also by the Old Testament. Accordingly we find one of the prophets, when imprecating upon himself certain punishments for the commission of certain sins, includes among the punishments this one of earthly glory. He says, "O Lord my God, if I have done this; if there be iniquity in my hands; if I have rewarded evil unto him that was at peace with me; (yea, rather, I have delivered him that without cause is mine enemy;) let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it; yea, let him tread down my life upon the earth, and *set my glory up on high*."[1] And these precepts of our Lord, "Take no thought what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink. Behold the fowls of the air, or behold the ravens: for they sow not, neither do they reap; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. How much better are ye than they! And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field;"[2] —these precepts, and those which follow, are not inconsistent with the promised blessings of the law, which teaches that the just "shall eat their bread to the full;"[3] nor with that saying of Solomon, "The righteous eateth to the satisfying of his soul, but the belly of the wicked shall want."[4] For we must consider the food promised in the law as the food of the soul, which is to satisfy not both parts of man's nature, but the soul only. And the words of the Gospel, although probably containing a deeper meaning, may yet be taken in their more simple and obvious sense, as teaching us not to be disturbed with anxieties about our food and clothing, but, while living in plainness, and desiring only what is needful, to put our trust in the providence of God.

Chapter xxv.

Celsus then extracts from the Gospel the precept, "To him who strikes thee once, thou shalt offer thyself to be struck again," although without giving any passage from the Old Testament

[1] Ps. vii. 3–5. Origen follows the reading εἰς χοῦν instead of εἰς χνοῦν, "make my glory abide *in the dust*."

[2] Matt. vi. 25–28. [3] Lev. xxvi. 5. [4] Prov. xiii. 25.

which he considers opposed to it. On the one hand, we know that "it was said to them in old time, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;"[1] and on the other, we have read, "I say unto you, Whoever shall smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also."[2] But as there is reason to believe that Celsus produces the objections which he has heard from those who wish to make a difference between the God of the gospel and the God of the law, we must say in reply, that this precept, "Whosoever shall strike thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other," is not unknown to the older Scriptures. For thus, in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, it is said, "It is good for a man that he beareth the yoke in his youth: he sitteth alone, and keepeth silence, because he hath borne it upon him: he giveth his cheek to him that smiteth him; he is filled full with reproach."[3] There is no discrepancy, then, between the God of the gospel and the God of the law, even when we take literally the precept regarding the blow on the face. So, then, we infer that neither "Jesus nor Moses has taught falsely." The Father in sending Jesus did not "forget the commands which He had given to Moses:" He did not "change His mind, condemn His own laws, and send by His messenger counter instructions."

Chapter xxvi.

However, if we must refer briefly to the difference between the constitution which was given to the Jews of old by Moses, and that which the Christians, under the direction of Christ's teaching, wish now to establish, we would observe that it must be impossible for the legislation of Moses, taken literally, to harmonize with the calling of the Gentiles, and with their subjection to the Roman government; and on the other hand, it would be impossible for the Jews to preserve their civil economy unchanged, supposing that they should embrace the gospel. For Christians could not slay their enemies, or condemn to be burned or stoned, as Moses commands, those who had broken the law, and were therefore condemned as deserving of these punishments; since the Jews themselves, however desirous of carrying out their law, are not able to inflict these punishments.

[1] Ex. xxi. 24. [2] Matt. v. 39. [3] Lam. iii. 27, 29, 30.

But in the case of the ancient Jews, who had a land and a form of government of their own, to take from them the right of making war upon their enemies, of fighting for their country, of putting to death or otherwise punishing adulterers, murderers, or others who were guilty of similar crimes, would be to subject them to sudden and utter destruction whenever the enemy fell upon them; for their very laws would in that case restrain them, and prevent them from resisting the enemy. And that same providence which of old gave the law, and has now given the gospel of Jesus Christ, not wishing the Jewish state to continue longer, has destroyed their city and their temple: it has abolished the worship which was offered to God in that temple by the sacrifice of victims, and other ceremonies which He had prescribed. And as it has destroyed these things, not wishing that they should longer continue, in like manner it has extended day by day the Christian religion, so that it is now preached everywhere with boldness, and that in spite of the numerous obstacles which oppose the spread of Christ's teaching in the world. But since it was the purpose of God that the nations should receive the benefits of Christ's teaching, all the devices of men against Christians have been brought to nought; for the more that kings, and rulers, and peoples have persecuted them everywhere, the more have they increased in number and grown in strength.

Chapter xxvii.

After this Celsus relates at length opinions which he ascribes to us, but which we do not hold, regarding the Divine Being, to the effect that "he is corporeal in his nature, and possesses a body like a man." As he undertakes to refute opinions which are none of ours, it would be needless to give either the opinions themselves or their refutation. Indeed, if we did hold those views of God which he ascribes to us, and which he opposes, we would be bound to quote his words, to adduce our own arguments, and to refute his. But if he brings forward opinions which he has either heard from no one, or if it be assumed that he has heard them, it must have been from those who are very simple and ignorant of the meaning of Scripture, then we need not undertake so superfluous a task as that of

refuting them. For the Scriptures plainly speak of God as of a being without body. Hence it is said, "No man hath seen God at any time;"[1] and the First-born of all creation is called "the image of the invisible God,"[2] which is the same as if it were said that He is incorporeal. However, we have already said something on the nature of God while examining into the meaning of the words, "God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Chapter xxviii.

After thus misrepresenting our views of the nature of God, Celsus goes on to ask of us "where we hope to go after death;" and he makes our answer to be, "to another land better than this." On this he comments as follows: "The divine men of a former age have spoken of a happy life reserved for the souls of the blessed. Some designated it 'the isles of the blest,' and others 'the Elysian plain,' so called because they were there to be delivered from their present evils. Thus Homer says: 'But the gods shall send thee to the Elysian plain, on the borders of the earth, where they lead a most quiet life.'[3] Plato also, who believed in the immortality of the soul, distinctly gives the name 'land' to the place where it is sent. 'The extent of it,'[4] says he, 'is immense, and we only occupy a small portion of it, from the Phasis to the Pillars of Hercules, where we dwell along the shores of the sea, as grasshoppers and frogs beside a marsh. But there are many other places inhabited in like manner by other men. For there are in different parts of the earth cavities, varying in form and in magnitude, into which run water, and clouds, and air. But that land which is pure lies in the pure region of heaven.'" Celsus therefore supposes that what we say of a land which is much better and more excellent than this, has been borrowed from certain ancient writers whom he styles "divine," and chiefly from Plato, who in his *Phædon* discourses on the pure land lying in a pure heaven. But he does not see that Moses, who is much older than the Greek literature, introduces God as promising to those who lived according to His law the holy

[1] John i. 18.
[2] Col. i. 15.
[3] *Odys.* iv. 563.
[4] *Phædon*, p. 109.

land, which is "a good land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey;"[1] which promise is not to be understood to refer, as some suppose, to that part of the earth which we call Judæa; for it, however good it may be, still forms part of the earth, which was originally cursed for the transgression of Adam. For these words, "Cursed shall the ground be for what thou hast done; with grief, that is, with labour, shalt thou eat of the fruit of it all the days of thy life,"[2] were spoken of the whole earth, the fruit of which every man who died in Adam eats with sorrow or labour all the days of his life. And as all the earth has been cursed, it brings forth thorns and briers all the days of the life of those who in Adam were driven out of paradise; and in the sweat of his face every man eats bread until he returns to the ground from which he was taken. For the full exposition of all that is contained in this passage much might be said; but we have confined ourselves to these few words at present, which are intended to remove the idea, that what is said of the good land promised by God to the righteous, refers to the land of Judæa.

Chapter xxix.

If, then, the whole earth has been cursed in the deeds of Adam and of those who died in him, it is plain that all parts of the earth share in the curse, and among others the land of Judæa; so that the words, "a good land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey," cannot apply to it, although we may say of it, that both Judæa and Jerusalem were the shadow and figure of that pure land, goodly and large, in the pure region of heaven, in which is the heavenly Jerusalem. And it is in reference to this Jerusalem that the apostle spoke, as one who, "being risen with Christ, and seeking those things which are above," had found a truth which formed no part of the Jewish mythology. "Ye are come," says he, "unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels."[3] And in order to be assured that our explanation of "the good and large land" of Moses is not contrary to the intention of the Divine Spirit, we have only to read in all the prophets what they say

[1] Ex. iii. 8. [2] Gen. iii. 17. [3] Heb. xii. 22.

of those who, after having left Jerusalem, and wandered astray from it, should afterwards return and be settled in the place which is called the habitation and city of God, as in the words, "His dwelling is in the holy place;"[1] and, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of His holiness, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth."[2] It is enough at present to quote the words of the thirty-seventh Psalm, which speaks thus of the land of the righteous, "Those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth;" and a little after, "But the meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace;" and again, "Those who bless Him shall inherit the earth;" and, "The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever."[3] And consider whether it is not evident to intelligent readers that the following words from this same Psalm refer to the pure land in the pure heaven: "Wait on the Lord, and keep His way; and He shall exalt thee to inherit the land."

Chapter xxx.

It seems to me also that that fancy of Plato, that those stones which we call precious stones derive their lustre from a reflection, as it were, of the stones in that better land, is taken from the words of Isaiah in describing the city of God, "I will make thy battlements of jasper, thy stones shall be crystal, and thy borders of precious stones;"[4] and, "I will lay thy foundations with sapphires." Those who hold in greatest reverence the teaching of Plato, explain this myth of his as an allegory. And the prophecies from which, as we conjecture, Plato has borrowed, will be explained by those who, leading a godly life like that of the prophets, devote all their time to the study of the sacred Scriptures, to those who are qualified to learn by purity of life, and their desire to advance in divine knowledge. For our part, our purpose has been simply to say that what we affirm of that sacred land has not been taken from Plato or any of the Greeks, but that they rather—living as they did not only after Moses, who was the oldest, but even

[1] Ps. lxxvi. 2; English version, "In Salem is His tabernacle."
[2] Ps. xlviii. 1, 2.
[3] Ps. xxxvii. 9, 11, 22, 29, 34.
[4] Isa. liv. 12, 11.

after most of the prophets—borrowed from them, and in so doing either misunderstood their obscure intimations on such subjects, or else endeavoured, in their allusions to the better land, to imitate those portions of Scripture which had fallen into their hands. Haggai expressly makes a distinction between the earth and the dry land, meaning by the latter the land in which we live. He says: "Yet once, and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the dry land, and the sea."[1]

Chapter xxxi.

Referring to the passage in the *Phædon* of Plato, Celsus says: "It is not easy for every one to understand the meaning of Plato's words, when he says that on account of our weakness and slowness we are unable to reach the highest region of the air; but that if our nature were capable of so sublime a contemplation, we would then be able to understand that that is the true heaven, and that the true light." As Celsus has deferred to another opportunity the explanation of Plato's idea, we also think that it does not fall within our purpose at present to enter into any full description of that holy and good land, and of the city of God which is in it; but reserve the consideration of it for our Commentary on the Prophets, having already in part, according to our power, treated of the city of God in our remarks on the forty-sixth and forty-eighth Psalms. The writings of Moses and the prophets—the most ancient of all books—teach us that all things here on earth which are in common use among men, have other things corresponding to them in name which are alone real. Thus, for instance, there is the true light, and another heaven beyond the firmament, and a Sun of righteousness other than the sun we see. In a word, to distinguish those things from the objects of sense, which have no true reality, they say of God that "His works are truth;"[2] thus making a distinction between the works of God and the works of God's hands, which latter are of an inferior sort. Accordingly, God in Isaiah complains of men, that "they regard not the works of the Lord, nor consider the operation of His hands."[3] But enough on this point.

[1] Hagg. ii. 6. [2] Dan. iv. 37. [3] Isa. v. 12.

Chapter xxxii.

Celsus next assails the doctrine of the resurrection, which is a high and difficult doctrine, and one which more than others requires a high and advanced degree of wisdom to set forth how worthy it is of God; and how sublime a truth it is which teaches us that there is a seminal principle lodged in that which Scripture speaks of as the "tabernacle" of the soul, in which the righteous "do groan, being burdened, not for that they would be unclothed, but clothed upon."[1] Celsus ridicules this doctrine because he does not understand it, and because he has learnt it from ignorant persons, who were unable to support it on any reasonable grounds. It will be profitable, therefore, that in addition to what we have said above, we should make this one remark. Our teaching on the subject of the resurrection is not, as Celsus imagines, derived from anything that we have heard on the doctrine of metempsychosis; but we know that the soul, which is immaterial and invisible in its nature, exists in no material place, without having a body suited to the nature of that place. Accordingly, it at one time puts off one body which was necessary before, but which is no longer adequate in its changed state, and it exchanges it for a second; and at another time it assumes another in addition to the former, which is needed as a better covering, suited to the purer etherial regions of heaven. When it comes into the world at birth, it casts off the integuments which it needed in the womb; and before doing this, it puts on another body suited for its life upon earth. Then, again, as there is "a tabernacle" and "an earthly house" which is in some sort necessary for this tabernacle, Scripture teaches us that "the earthly house of this tabernacle shall be dissolved," but that the tabernacle shall "be clothed upon with a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."[2] The men of God say also that "the corruptible shall put on incorruption,"[3] which is a different thing from "the incorruptible;" and "the mortal shall put on immortality," which is different from "the immortal." Indeed, what "wisdom" is to "the wise," and "justice" to "the just," and "peace" to "the peaceable," the same

[1] 2 Cor. v. 1, 4. [2] 2 Cor. v. 1. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 53.

relation does "incorruption" hold to "the incorruptible," and "immortality" to "the immortal." Behold, then, to what a prospect Scripture encourages us to look, when it speaks to us of being clothed with incorruption and immortality, which are, as it were, vestments which will not suffer those who are covered with them to come to corruption or death. Thus far I have taken the liberty of referring to this subject, in answer to one who assails the doctrine of the resurrection without understanding it, and who, simply because he knew nothing about it, made it the object of contempt and ridicule.

Chapter XXXIII.

As Celsus supposes that we uphold the doctrine of the resurrection in order that we may see and know God, he thus follows out his notions on the subject: "After they have been utterly refuted and vanquished, they still, as if regardless of all objections, come back again to the same question, 'How then shall we see and know God? how shall we go to Him?'" Let any, however, who are disposed to hear us observe, that if we have need of a body for other purposes, as for occupying a material locality to which this body must be adapted, and if on that account the "tabernacle" is clothed in the way we have shown, we have no need of a body in order to know God. For that which sees God is not the eye of the body; it is the mind which is made in the image of the Creator,[1] and which God has in His providence rendered capable of that knowledge. To see God belongs to the pure heart, out of which no longer proceed "evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies, the evil eye,"[2] or any other evil thing. Wherefore it is said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."[3] But as the strength of our will is not sufficient to procure the perfectly pure heart, and as we need that God should create it, he therefore who prays as he ought, offers this petition to God, "Create in me a clean heart, O God."[4]

[1] Bouhéreau follows the reading, "the mind which sees what is made in the image of the Creator."

[2] Matt. xv. 19 and vi. 23. [3] Matt. v. 8. [4] Ps. li. 10.

Chapter XXXIV.

And we do not ask the question, "How shall we go to God?" as though we thought that God existed in some place. God is of too excellent a nature for any place: He holds all things in His power, and is Himself not confined by anything whatever. The precept, therefore, "Thou shalt walk after the Lord thy God,"[1] does not command a bodily approach to God; neither does the prophet refer to physical nearness to God, when he says in his prayer, "My soul followeth hard after Thee."[2] Celsus therefore misrepresents us, when he says that we expect to see God with our bodily eyes, to hear Him with our ears, and to touch Him sensibly with our hands. We know that the holy Scriptures make mention of eyes, of ears, and of hands, which have nothing but the name in common with the bodily organs; and what is more wonderful, they speak of a diviner sense, which is very different from the senses as commonly spoken of. For when the prophet says, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law,"[3] or, "The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes,"[4] or, "Lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death,"[5] no one is so foolish as to suppose that the eyes of the body behold the wonders of the divine law, or that the law of the Lord gives light to the bodily eyes, or that the sleep of death falls on the eyes of the body. When our Saviour says, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,"[6] any one will understand that the ears spoken of are of a diviner kind. When it is said that the word of the Lord was "in the hand" of Jeremiah or of some other prophet; or when the expression is used, "the law by the hand of Moses," or, "I sought the Lord with my hands, and was not deceived,"[7]—no one is so foolish as not to see that the word "hands" is taken figuratively, as when John says, "Our hands have handled the Word of life."[8] And if you wish further to learn from the sacred writings that there is a diviner sense

[1] Deut. xiii. 4.
[2] Ps. lxiii. 8.
[3] Ps. cxix. 18.
[4] Ps. xix. 8.
[5] Ps. xiii. 3.
[6] Matt. xiii. 9.
[7] Ps. lxxvii. 2, according to the LXX.
[8] 1 John i. 1.

than the senses of the body, you have only to hear what Solomon says, "Thou shalt find a divine sense."[1]

Chapter xxxv.

Seeking God, then, in this way, we have no need to visit the oracles of Trophonius, of Amphiaraus, and of Mopsus, to which Celsus would send us, assuring us that we would there "see the gods in human form, appearing to us with all distinctness, and without illusion." For we know that these are demons, feeding on the blood, and smoke, and odour of victims, and shut up by their base desires in prisons, which the Greeks call temples of the gods, but which we know are only the dwellings of deceitful demons. To this Celsus maliciously adds, in regard to these gods which, according to him, are in human form, "they do not show themselves for once, or at intervals, like him who has deceived men, but they are ever open to intercourse with those who desire it." From this remark, it would seem that Celsus supposes that the appearance of Christ to His disciples after His resurrection was like that of a spectre flitting before their eyes; whereas these gods, as he calls them, in human shape always present themselves to those who desire it. But how is it possible that a phantom which, as he describes it, flew past to deceive the beholders, could produce such effects after it had passed away, and could so turn the hearts of men as to lead them to regulate their actions according to the will of God, as in view of being hereafter judged by Him? And how could a phantom drive away demons, and show other indisputable evidences of power, and that not in any one place, like these so-called gods in human form, but making its divine power felt through the whole world, in drawing and congregating together all who are found disposed to lead a good and noble life?

Chapter xxxvi.

After these remarks of Celsus, which we have endeavoured to answer as we could, he goes on to say, speaking of us: "Again they will ask, 'How can we know God, unless by the perception of the senses? for how otherwise than through the senses are we able to gain any knowledge?'" To this he replies: "This is

[1] Prov. ii. 5. E. V. and LXX., "Thou shalt find the knowledge of God."

not the language of a man; it comes not from the soul, but from the flesh. Let them hearken to us, if such a spiritless and carnal race are able to do so: if, instead of exercising the senses, you look upwards with the soul; if, turning away the eye of the body, you open the eye of the mind, thus and thus only will you be able to see God. And if you seek one to be your guide along this way, you must shun all deceivers and jugglers, who will introduce you to phantoms. Otherwise you will be acting the most ridiculous part, if, whilst you pronounce imprecations upon those others that are recognised as gods, treating them as idols, you yet do homage to a more wretched idol than any of these, which indeed is not even an idol or a phantom, but a dead man, and you seek a father like to him." The first remark which we have to make on this passage is in regard to his use of personification, by which he makes us defend in this way the doctrine of the resurrection. This figure of speech is properly employed when the character and sentiments of the person introduced are faithfully preserved; but it is an abuse of the figure when these do not agree with the character and opinions of the speaker. Thus we should justly condemn a man who put into the mouths of barbarians, slaves, or uneducated people the language of philosophy; because we know that the philosophy belonged to the author, and not to such persons, who could not know anything of philosophy. And in like manner we should condemn a man for introducing persons who are represented as wise and well versed in divine knowledge, and should make them give expression to language which could only come out of the mouths of those who are ignorant or under the influence of vulgar passions. Hence Homer is admired, among other things, for preserving a consistency of character in his heroes, as in Nestor, Ulysses, Diomede, Agamemnon, Telemachus, Penelope, and the rest. Euripides, on the contrary, was assailed in the comedies of Aristophanes as a frivolous talker, often putting into the mouth of a barbarian woman, a wretched slave, the wise maxims which he had learned from Anaxagoras or some other philosophers.

Chapter xxxvii.

Now if this is a true account of what constitutes the right and the wrong use of personification, have we not grounds for holding Celsus up to ridicule for thus ascribing to Christians words which they never uttered? For if those whom he represents as speaking are the unlearned, how is it possible that such persons could distinguish between "sense" and "reason," between "objects of sense" and "objects of the reason?" To argue in this way, they would require to have studied under the Stoics, who deny all intellectual existences, and maintain that all that we apprehend is apprehended through the senses, and that all knowledge comes through the senses. But if, on the other hand, he puts these words into the mouth of philosophers who search carefully into the meaning of Christian doctrines, the statements in question do not agree with their character and principles. For no one who has learnt that God is invisible, and that certain of His works are invisible, that is to say, apprehended by the reason,[1] can say, as if to justify his faith in a resurrection, "How can they know God, except by the perception of the senses?" or, "How otherwise than through the senses can they gain any knowledge?" For it is not in any secret writings, perused only by a few wise men, but in such as are most widely diffused and most commonly known among the people, that these words are written: "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made."[2] From whence it is to be inferred, that though men who live upon the earth have to begin with the use of the senses upon sensible objects, in order to go on from them to a knowledge of the nature of things intellectual, yet their knowledge must not stop short with the objects of sense. And thus, while Christians would not say that it is impossible to have a knowledge of intellectual objects without the senses, but rather that the senses supply the first means of obtaining knowledge, they might well ask the question, "Who can gain any knowledge without the senses?" without deserving

[1] νοητά, falling under the province of νοῦς, the reason. For convenience, we translate it elsewhere "intellectual."

[2] Rom. i. 20.

the abuse of Celsus, when he adds, "This is not the language of a man; it comes not from the soul, but from the flesh."

Chapter xxxviii.

Since we hold that the great God is in essence simple, invisible, and incorporeal, Himself pure intelligence, or something transcending intelligence and existence, we can never say that God is apprehended by any other means than through the intelligence which is formed in His image, though now, in the words of Paul, "we see in a glass obscurely, but then face to face."[1] And if we use the expression "face to face," let no one pervert its meaning; but let it be explained by this passage, "Beholding with open face the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory," which shows that we do not use the word in this connection to mean the visible face, but take it figuratively, in the same way as we have shown that the eyes, the ears, and the other parts of the body are employed. And it is certain that a man—I mean a soul using a body, otherwise called "the inner man," or simply "the soul"—would answer, not as Celsus makes us answer, but as the man of God himself teaches. It is certain also that a Christian will not make use of "the language of the flesh," having learnt as he has "to mortify the deeds of the body"[2] by the spirit, and "to bear about in his body the dying of Jesus;"[3] and "mortify your members which are on the earth,"[4] and with a true knowledge of these words, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh,"[5] and again, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God,"[6] he strives in every way to live no longer according to the flesh, but only according to the Spirit.

Chapter xxxix.

Now let us hear what it is that he invites us to learn, that we may ascertain from him how we are to know God, although he thinks that his words are beyond the capacity of all Christians. "Let them hear," says he, "if they are able to do so." We have then to consider what the philosopher wishes us to hear from him. But instead of instructing us as he ought, he abuses

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12. [2] Rom. viii. 13. [3] 2 Cor. iv. 10.
[4] Col. iii. 5. [5] Gen. vi. 3. [6] Rom. viii. 8.

us; and while he should have shown his goodwill to those whom he addresses at the outset of his discourse, he stigmatizes as "a cowardly race" men who would rather die than abjure Christianity even by a word, and who are ready to suffer every form of torture, or any kind of death. He also applies to us the epithet "carnal" or "flesh-indulging," "although," as we are wont to say, "we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth we know Him no more,"[1] and although we are so ready to lay down our lives for the cause of religion, that no philosopher could lay aside his robes more readily. He then addresses to us these words: "If, instead of exercising your senses, you look upwards with the soul; if, turning away the eye of the body, you open the eye of the mind, thus and thus only you will be able to see God." He is not aware that this reference to the two eyes, the eye of the body and the eye of the mind, which he has borrowed from the Greeks, was in use among our own writers; for Moses, in his account of the creation of the world, introduces man before his transgression as both seeing and not seeing: seeing, when it is said of the woman, "The woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise;"[2] and again not seeing, as when he introduces the serpent saying to the woman, as if she and her husband had been blind, "God knows that on the day that ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened;"[3] and also when it is said, "They did eat, and the eyes of both of them were opened."[4] The eyes of sense were then opened, which they had done well to keep shut, that they might not be distracted, and hindered from seeing with the eyes of the mind; and it was those eyes of the mind which in consequence of sin, as I imagine, were then closed, with which they had up to that time enjoyed the delight of beholding God and His paradise. This twofold kind of vision in us was familiar to our Saviour, who says, "For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind,"[5]—meaning by the eyes that see not the eyes of the mind, which are enlightened by His teaching; and the eyes which see are the eyes of sense, which His words do render blind,

[1] 2 Cor. v. 16. [2] Gen. iii. 6. [3] Gen. iii. 5.
[4] Gen. iii. 7. [5] John ix. 39.

in order that the soul may look without distraction upon proper objects. All true Christians therefore have the eye of the mind sharpened, and the eye of sense closed; so that each one, according to the degree in which his better eye is quickened, and the eye of sense darkened, sees and knows the Supreme God, and His Son, who is the Word, Wisdom, and so forth.

Chapter xl.

Next to the remarks of Celsus on which we have already commented, come others which he addresses to all Christians, but which, if applicable to any, ought to be addressed to persons whose doctrines differ entirely from those taught by Jesus. For it is the Ophians who, as we have before shown,[1] have utterly renounced Jesus, and perhaps some others of similar opinions who are "the impostors and jugglers, leading men away to idols and phantoms;" and it is they who with miserable pains learn off the names of the heavenly doorkeepers. These words are therefore quite inappropriate as addressed to Christians: "If you seek one to be your guide along this way, you must shun all deceivers and jugglers, who will introduce you to phantoms." And, as though quite unaware that these impostors entirely agree with him, and are not behind him in speaking ill of Jesus and His religion, he thus continues, confounding us with them: "otherwise you will be acting the most ridiculous part, if, whilst you pronounce imprecations upon those other recognised gods, treating them as idols, you yet do homage to a more wretched idol than any of these, which indeed is not even an idol or a phantom, but a dead man, and you seek a father like to himself." That he is ignorant of the wide difference between our opinions and those of the inventors of these fables, and that he imagines the charges which he makes against them applicable to us, is evident from the following passage: "For the sake of such a monstrous delusion, and in support of those wonderful advisers, and those wonderful words which you address to the lion, to the amphibious creature, to the creature in the form of an ass, and to others, for the sake of those divine doorkeepers whose names you commit to memory with such pains, in such a cause as this you suffer cruel tortures, and perish at the stake."

[1] See Book vi. chap. xxx. etc.

Surely, then, he is unaware that none of those who regard beings in the form of an ass, a lion, or an amphibious animal, as the doorkeepers or guides on the way to heaven, ever expose themselves to death in defence of that which they think the truth. That excess of zeal, if it may be so called, which leads us for the sake of religion to submit to every kind of death, and to perish at the stake, is ascribed by Celsus to those who endure no such sufferings; and he reproaches us who suffer crucifixion for our faith, with believing in fabulous creatures—in the lion, the amphibious animal, and other such monsters. If we reject all these fables, it is not out of deference to Celsus, for we have never at any time held any such fancies; but it is in accordance with the teaching of Jesus that we oppose all such notions, and will not allow to Michael, or to any others that have been referred to, a form and figure of that sort.

Chapter xli.

But let us consider who those persons are whose guidance Celsus would have us to follow, so that we may not be in want of guides who are recommended both by their antiquity and sanctity. He refers us to divinely inspired poets, as he calls them, to wise men and philosophers, without mentioning their names; so that, after promising to point out those who should guide us, he simply hands us over in a general way to divinely inspired poets, wise men, and philosophers. If he had specified their names in particular, we should have felt ourselves bound to show him that he wished to give us as guides men who were blinded to the truth, and who must therefore lead us into error; or that if not wholly blinded, yet they are in error in many matters of belief. But whether Orpheus, Parmenides, Empedocles, or even Homer himself, and Hesiod, are the persons whom he means by "inspired poets," let any one show how those who follow their guidance walk in a better way, or lead a more excellent life, than those who, being taught in the school of Jesus Christ, have rejected all images and statues, and even all Jewish superstition, that they may look upward through the Word of God to the one God, who is the Father of the Word. Who, then, are those wise men and philosophers from whom Celsus would have us to learn so many divine truths, and for whom we are to

give up Moses the servant of God, the prophets of the Creator of the world, who have spoken so many things by a truly divine inspiration, and even Him who has given light and taught the way of piety to the whole human race, so that no one can reproach Him if he remains without a share in the knowledge of His mysteries? Such, indeed, was the abounding love which He had for men, that He gave to the more learned a theology capable of raising the soul far above all earthly things; while with no less consideration He comes down to the weaker capacities of ignorant men, of simple women, of slaves, and, in short, of all those who from Jesus alone could have received that help for the better regulation of their lives which is supplied by His instructions in regard to the Divine Being, adapted to their wants and capacities.

Chapter XLII.

Celsus next refers us to Plato as to a more effective teacher of theological truth, and quotes the following passage from the *Timæus:* "It is a hard matter to find out the Maker and Father of this universe; and after having found Him, it is impossible to make Him known to all." To which he himself adds this remark: "You perceive, then, how divine men seek after the way of truth, and how well Plato knew that it was impossible for all men to walk in it. But as wise men have found it for the express purpose of being able to convey to us some notion of Him who is the first, the unspeakable Being,—a notion, namely, which may represent Him to us through the medium of other objects,—they endeavour either by synthesis, which is the combining of various qualities, or by analysis, which is the separation and setting aside of some qualities, or finally by analogy;—in these ways, I say, they endeavour to set before us that which it is impossible to express in words. I should therefore be surprised if you could follow in that course, since you are so completely wedded to the flesh as to be incapable of seeing aught but what is impure." These words of Plato are noble and admirable; but see if Scripture does not give us an example of a regard for mankind still greater in God the Word, who was "in the beginning with God," and "who was made flesh," in order that He might reveal to all men

truths which, according to Plato, it would be impossible to make known to all men, even after he had found them himself. Plato may say that "it is a hard thing to find out the Creator and Father of this universe;" by which language he implies that it is not wholly beyond the power of human nature to attain to such a knowledge as is either worthy of God, or if not, is far beyond that which is commonly attained (although if it were true that Plato or any other of the Greeks had found God, they would never have given homage and worship, or ascribed the name of God, to any other than to Him: they would have abandoned all others, and would not have associated with this great God objects which can have nothing in common with Him). For ourselves, we maintain that human nature is in no way able to seek after God, or to attain a clear knowledge of Him without the help of Him whom it seeks. He makes Himself known to those who, after doing all that their powers will allow, confess that they need help from Him, who discovers Himself to those whom He approves, in so far as it is possible for man and the soul still dwelling in the body to know God.

Chapter xliii.

Observe that when Plato says, that "after having found out the Creator and Father of the universe, it is impossible to make Him known to all men," he does not speak of Him as unspeakable, and as incapable of being expressed in words. On the contrary, he implies that He may be spoken of, and that there are a few to whom He may be made known. But Celsus, as if forgetting the language which he had just quoted from Plato, immediately gives God the name of "the unspeakable." He says: "since the wise men have found out this way, in order to be able to give us some idea of the First of Beings, who is unspeakable." For ourselves, we hold that not God alone is unspeakable, but other things also which are inferior to Him. Such are the things which Paul labours to express when he says, "I heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter,"[1] where the word "heard" is used in the sense of "understood;" as in the passage, "He who hath ears to hear,

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 4.

let him hear." We also hold that it is a hard matter to see the Creator and Father of the universe; but it is possible to see Him in the way thus referred to, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;"[1] and not only so, but also in the sense of the words of Him "who is the image of the invisible God;" "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father who sent me."[2] No sensible person could suppose that these last words were spoken in reference to His bodily presence, which was open to the view of all; otherwise all those who said, "Crucify him, crucify him," and Pilate, who had power over the humanity of Jesus, were among those who saw God the Father, which is absurd. Moreover, that these words, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father who sent me," are not to be taken in their grosser sense, is plain from the answer which He gave to Philip, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet dost thou not know me, Philip?" after Philip had asked, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." He, then, who perceives how these words, "The Word was made flesh," are to be understood of the only-begotten Son of God, the first-born of all creation, will also understand how, in seeing the image of the invisible God, we see "the Creator and Father of the universe."

Chapter xliv.

Celsus supposes that we may arrive at a knowledge of God either by combining or separating certain things after the methods which mathematicians call synthesis and analysis, or again by analogy, which is employed by them also, and that in this way we may as it were gain admission to the chief good. But when the Word of God says, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him,"[3] He declares that no one can know God but by the help of divine grace coming from above, with a certain divine inspiration. Indeed, it is reasonable to suppose that the knowledge of God is beyond the reach of human nature, and hence the many errors into which men have fallen in their views of God. It is, then, through the goodness and love of God to mankind, and by a marvellous exercise of divine grace to those whom He saw

[1] Matt. v. 8. [2] John xiv. 9. [3] Matt. xi. 27.

in His foreknowledge, and knew that they would walk worthy of Him who had made Himself known to them, and that they would never swerve from a faithful attachment to His service, although they were condemned to death or held up to ridicule by those who, in ignorance of what true religion is, give that name to what deserves to be called anything rather than religion. God doubtless saw the pride and arrogance of those who, with contempt for all others, boast of their knowledge of God, and of their profound acquaintance with divine things obtained from philosophy, but who still, not less even than the most ignorant, run after their images, and temples, and famous mysteries; and seeing this, He "has chosen the foolish things of this world"[1]—the simplest of Christians, who lead, however, a life of greater moderation and purity than many philosophers —"to confound the wise," who are not ashamed to address inanimate things as gods or images of the gods. For what reasonable man can refrain from smiling when he sees that one who has learned from philosophy such profound and noble sentiments about God or the gods, turns straightway to images and offers to them his prayers, or imagines that by gazing upon these material things he can ascend from the visible symbol to that which is spiritual and immaterial. But a Christian, even of the common people, is assured that every place forms part of the universe, and that the whole universe is God's temple. In whatever part of the world he is, he prays; but he rises above the universe, "shutting the eyes of sense, and raising upwards the eyes of the soul." And he stops not at the vault of heaven; but passing in thought beyond the heavens, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, and having thus as it were gone beyond the visible universe, he offers prayers to God. But he prays for no trivial blessings, for he has learnt from Jesus to seek for nothing small or mean, that is, sensible objects, but to ask only for what is great and truly divine; and these things God grants to us, to lead us to that blessedness which is found only with Him through His Son, the Word, who is God.

Chapter XLV.

But let us see further what the things are which he proposes

[1] 1 Cor. i. 27.

to teach us, if indeed we can comprehend them, since he speaks of us as being "utterly wedded to the flesh;" although if we live well, and in accordance with the teaching of Jesus, we hear this said of us: "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in you."[1] He says also that we look upon nothing that is pure, although our endeavour is to keep even our thoughts free from all defilement of sin, and although in prayer we say, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me,"[2] so that we may behold Him with that "pure heart" to which alone is granted the privilege of seeing Him. This, then, is what he proposes for our instruction: "Things are either *intelligible*, which we call substance—being; or *visible*, which we call *becoming*:[3] with the former is truth; from the latter arises error. Truth is the object of knowledge; truth and error form opinion. Intelligible objects are known by the reason, visible objects by the eyes; the action of the reason is called intelligent perception, that of the eyes vision. As, then, among visible things the sun is neither the eye nor vision, but that which enables the eye to see, and renders vision possible, and in consequence of it visible things are seen, all sensible things exist, and itself is rendered visible; so among things intelligible, that which is neither reason, nor intelligent perception, nor knowledge, is yet the cause which enables the reason to know, which renders intelligent perception possible; and in consequence of it knowledge arises, all things intelligible, truth itself and substance have their existence; and itself, which is above all these things, becomes in some ineffable way intelligible. These things are offered to the consideration of the intelligent; and if even you can understand any of them, it is well. And if you think that a Divine Spirit has descended from God to announce divine things to men, it is doubtless this same Spirit that reveals these truths, and it was under the same influence that men of old made known many important truths. But if you cannot comprehend these things, then keep silence; do not expose your own ignorance, and do not accuse of blindness those who see, or of lameness

[1] Rom. viii. 9. [2] Ps. li. 10.

[3] γένεσις. For the distinction between οὐσία and γένεσις, see Plato's *Sophista*, p. 246.

those who run, while you yourselves are utterly lamed and mutilated in mind, and lead a merely animal life—the life of the body, which is the dead part of our nature."

Chapter XLVI.

We are careful not to oppose fair arguments even if they proceed from those who are not of our faith; we strive not to be captious, or to seek to overthrow any sound reasonings. But here we have to reply to those who slander the character of persons wishing to do their best in the service of God, who accepts the faith which the meanest place in Him, as well as the more refined and intelligent piety of the learned; seeing that both alike address to the Creator of the world their prayers and thanksgivings through the High Priest who has set before men the nature of pure religion. We say, then, that those who are stigmatized as "lamed and mutilated in spirit," as "living only for the sake of the body which is dead," are persons whose endeavour it is to say with sincerity: "For though we live[1] in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not fleshly, but mighty through God." It is for those who throw out such vile accusations against men who desire to be God's servants, to beware lest, by the calumnies which they cast upon others who strive to live well, they "lame" their own souls, and "mutilate" the inner man, by severing from it that justice and moderation of mind which the Creator has planted in the nature of all His rational creatures. As for those, however, who, along with other lessons given by the Divine Word, have learned and practised this, "when reviled to bless, when persecuted to endure, when defamed to entreat,"[2] they may be said to be walking in spirit in the ways of uprightness, to be purifying and setting in order the whole soul. They distinguish—and to them the distinction is not one of words merely—between "substance," or that which is, and that which is "becoming;" between things apprehended by reason, and things apprehended by sense; and they connect truth with the one, and avoid the errors arising out of the other; looking, as they have been taught, not at the things "becoming" or

[1] 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. The received text has "walk" instead of "live."
[2] 1 Cor. iv. 11, 12.

phenomenal, which are seen, and therefore temporary, but at better things than these, whether we call them "substance," or "spiritual" things, as being apprehended by reason, or "invisible," because they lie out of the reach of the senses. The disciples of Jesus regard these phenomenal things only that they may use them as steps to ascend to the knowledge of the things of reason. For "the invisible things of God," that is, the objects of the reason, "from the creation of the world are clearly seen" by the reason, "being understood by the things that are made." And when they have risen from the created things of this world to the invisible things of God, they do not stay there; but after they have sufficiently exercised their minds upon these, and have understood their nature, they ascend to "the eternal power of God," in a word, to His divinity. For they know that God, in His love to men, has "manifested" His truth, and "that which is known of Him," not only to those who devote themselves to His service, but also to some who are far removed from the purity of worship and service which He requires; and that some of those who by the providence of God had attained a knowledge of these truths, were yet doing things unworthy of that knowledge, and "holding the truth in unrighteousness," and who are unable to find any excuse before God after the knowledge of such great truths which He has given them.

Chapter xlvii.

For Scripture testifies, in regard to those who have a knowledge of those things of which Celsus speaks, and who profess a philosophy founded on these principles, that they, "when they knew God, glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations;" and notwithstanding the bright light of knowledge with which God had enlightened them, "their foolish heart" was carried away, and became "darkened."[1] Thus we may see how those who accounted themselves wise gave proofs of great folly, when, after such grand arguments delivered in the schools on God and on things apprehended by the reason, they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."[2] As, then,

[1] Rom. i. 21. [2] Rom. i. 25.

they lived in a way unworthy of the knowledge which they had received from God, His providence leaving them to themselves, they were given "up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts to dishonour their own bodies,"[1] in shamelessness and licentiousness, because they "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator."

Chapter xlviii.

But those who are despised for their ignorance, and set down as fools and abject slaves, no sooner commit themselves to God's guidance by accepting the teaching of Jesus, than, so far from defiling themselves by licentious indulgence or the gratification of shameless passion, they in many cases, like perfect priests, for whom such pleasures have no charm, keep themselves in act and in thought in a state of virgin purity. The Athenians have one hierophant, who, not having confidence in his power to restrain his passions within the limits he prescribed for himself, determined to check them at their seat by the application of hemlock; and thus he was accounted pure, and fit for the celebration of religious worship among the Athenians. But among Christians may be found men who have no need of hemlock to fit them for the pure service of God, and for whom the Word in place of hemlock is able to drive all evil desires from their thoughts, so that they may present their prayers to the Divine Being. And attached to the other so-called gods are a select number of virgins, who are guarded by men, or it may be not guarded (for that is not the point in question at present), and who are supposed to live in purity for the honour of the god they serve. But among Christians, those who maintain a perpetual virginity do so for no human honours, for no fee or reward, from no motive of vainglory; but "as they choose to retain God in their knowledge,"[2] they are preserved by God in a spirit well-pleasing to Him, and in the discharge of every duty, being filled with all righteousness and goodness.

Chapter xlix.

What I have now said, then, is offered not for the purpose of

[1] Rom. i. 24, 25. [2] Rom. i. 28.

cavilling with any right opinions or sound doctrines held even by Greeks, but with the desire of showing that the same things, and indeed much better and diviner things than these, have been said by those divine men, the prophets of God and the apostles of Jesus. These truths are fully investigated by all who wish to attain a perfect knowledge of Christianity, and who know that "the mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom, and his tongue talketh of judgment; the law of his God is in his heart."[1] But even in regard to those who, either from deficiency of knowledge or want of inclination, or from not having Jesus to lead them to a rational view of religion, have not gone into these deep questions, we find that they believe in the Most High God, and in His only-begotten Son, the Word and God, and that they often exhibit in their character a high degree of gravity, of purity, and integrity; while those who call themselves wise have despised these virtues, and have wallowed in the filth of sodomy, in lawless lust, "men with men working that which is unseemly."[2]

Chapter L.

Celsus has not explained how error accompanies the "becoming," or product of generation; nor has he expressed himself with sufficient clearness to enable us to compare his ideas with ours, and to pass judgment on them. But the prophets, who have given some wise suggestions on the subject of things produced by generation, tell us that a sacrifice for sin was offered even for new-born infants, as not being free from sin. They say, "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me;"[3] also, "They are estranged from the womb;" which is followed by the singular expression, "They go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies."[4] Besides, our wise men have such a contempt for all sensible objects, that sometimes they speak of all material things as vanity: thus, "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that subjected the same in hope;"[5] at other times as vanity of vanities, "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, all is vanity."[6] Who has given so severe an estimate of the life of the human soul

[1] Ps. xxxvii. 30, 31. [2] Rom. i. 27. [3] Ps. li. 5.
[4] Ps. lviii. 3. [5] Rom. viii. 20. [6] Eccles. i. 2.

here on earth, as he who says: "Verily every man at his best estate is altogether vanity?"[1] He does not hesitate at all as to the difference between the present life of the soul and that which it is to lead hereafter. He does not say, "Who knows if to die is not to live, and if to live is not death?"[2] But he boldly proclaims the truth, and says, "Our soul is bowed down to the dust;"[3] and, "Thou hast brought me into the dust of death;"[4] and similarly, "Who will deliver me from the body of this death?"[5] also, "Who will change the body of our humiliation."[6] It is a prophet also who says, "Thou hast brought us down in a place of affliction;"[7] meaning by the "place of affliction" this earthly region, to which Adam, that is to say, man, came after he was driven out of paradise for sin. Observe also how well the different life of the soul here and hereafter has been recognised by him who says, "Now we see in a glass, obscurely, but then face to face;"[8] and, "Whilst we are in our home in the body, we are away from our home in the Lord;" wherefore "we are well content to go from our home in the body, and to come to our home with the Lord."[9]

Chapter li.

But what need is there to quote any more passages against Celsus, in order to prove that his words contain nothing which was not said long before among ourselves, since that has been sufficiently established by what we have said? It seems that what follows has some reference to this: "If you think that a Divine Spirit has descended from God to announce divine things to men, it is doubtless this same Spirit that reveals these truths; and it was under the same influence that men of old made known many important truths." But he does not know how great is the difference between those things and the clear and certain teaching of those who say to us, "Thine incorruptible spirit is in all things, wherefore God chasteneth them by little and little that offend;"[10] and of those who, among their other instructions, teach us that the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost,"[11]

[1] Ps. xxxix. 5.
[2] Euripides.
[3] Ps. xliv. 25.
[4] Ps. xxii. 15.
[5] Rom. vii. 24.
[6] Phil. iii. 21.
[7] Ps. xliii. 19, LXX.
[8] 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
[9] 2 Cor. v. 6, 8.
[10] Wisd. xii. 1, 2.
[11] John xx. 22.

refer to a degree of spiritual influence higher than that in the passage, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."[1] But it is a difficult matter, even after much careful consideration, to perceive the difference between those who have received a knowledge of the truth and a notion of God at different intervals and for short periods of time, and those who are more fully inspired by God, who have constant communion with Him, and are always led by His Spirit. Had Celsus set himself to understand this, he would not have reproached us with ignorance, or forbidden us to characterize as "blind" those who believe that religion shows itself in such products of man's mechanical art as images. For every one who sees with the eyes of his soul serves the Divine Being in no other way than in that which leads him ever to have regard to the Creator of all, to address his prayers to Him alone, and to do all things as in the sight of God, who sees us altogether, even to our thoughts. Our earnest desire then is both to see for ourselves, and to be leaders of the blind, to bring them to the Word of God, that He may take away from their minds the blindness of ignorance. And if our actions are worthy of Him who taught His disciples, "Ye are the light of the world,"[2] and of the Word, who says, "The light shineth in darkness,"[3] then we shall be light to those who are in darkness; we shall give wisdom to those who are without it, and we shall instruct the ignorant.

Chapter lii.

And let not Celsus be angry if we describe as lame and mutilated in soul those who run to the temples as to places having a real sacredness, and who cannot see that no mere mechanical work of man can be truly sacred. Those whose piety is grounded on the teaching of Jesus also run until they come to the end of their course, when they can say in all truth and confidence: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."[4] And each of us runs "not as uncertain," and he so fights with evil "not as one beating the air,"[5] but as against those who are subject to "the prince

[1] Acts i. 5. [2] Matt. v. 14. [3] John i. 5.
[4] 2 Tim. iv. 7. [5] 1 Cor. ix. 26.

of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."[1] Celsus may indeed say of us that we "live with the body which is a dead thing;" but we have learnt, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye by the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live;"[2] and, "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."[3] Would that we might convince him by our actions that he did us wrong, when he said that we "live with the body which is dead!"

Chapter LIII.

After these remarks of Celsus, which we have done our best to refute, he goes on to address us thus: "Seeing you are so eager for some novelty, how much better it would have been if you had chosen as the object of your zealous homage some one of those who died a glorious death, and whose divinity might have received the support of some myth to perpetuate his memory! Why, if you were not satisfied with Hercules or Æsculapius, and other heroes of antiquity, you had Orpheus, who was confessedly a divinely inspired man, who died a violent death. But perhaps some others have taken him up before you. You may then take Anaxarchus, who, when cast into a mortar, and beaten most barbarously, showed a noble contempt for his suffering, and said, 'Beat, beat the shell of Anaxarchus, for himself you do not beat,'—a speech surely of a spirit truly divine. But others were before you in following his interpretation of the laws of nature. Might you not, then, take Epictetus, who, when his master was twisting his leg, said, smiling and unmoved, 'You will break my leg;' and when it was broken, he added, 'Did I not tell you that you would break it?' What saying equal to these did your god utter under suffering? If you had said even of the Sibyl, whose authority some of you acknowledge, that she was a child of God, you would have said something more reasonable. But you have had the presumption to include in her writings many impious things, and set up as a god one who ended a most infamous life by a most miserable death. How much more suitable than he would have been Jonah in the whale's belly, or Daniel delivered from the wild beasts, or any of a still more portentous kind!"

[1] Eph. ii. 2. [2] Rom. viii. 13. [3] Gal. v. 25.

Chapter liv.

But since he sends us to Hercules, let him repeat to us any of his sayings, and let him justify his shameful subjection to Omphale. Let him show that divine honours should be paid to one who, like a highway robber, carries off a farmer's ox by force, and afterwards devours it, amusing himself meanwhile with the curses of the owner; in memory of which even to this day sacrifices offered to the demon of Hercules are accompanied with curses. Again he proposes Æsculapius to us, as if to oblige us to repeat what we have said already; but we forbear. In regard to Orpheus, what does he admire in him to make him assert that, by common consent, he was regarded as a divinely inspired man, and lived a noble life? I am greatly deceived if it is not the desire which Celsus has to oppose us and put down Jesus that leads him to sound forth the praises of Orpheus; and whether, when he made himself acquainted with his impious fables about the gods, he did not cast them aside as deserving, even more than the poems of Homer, to be excluded from a well-ordered state. For, indeed, Orpheus says much worse things than Homer of those whom they call gods. Noble, indeed, it was in Anaxarchus to say to Aristocreon, tyrant of Cyprus, "Beat on, beat the shell of Anaxarchus," but it is the one admirable incident in the life of Anaxarchus known to the Greeks; and although, on the strength of that, some like Celsus might deservedly honour the man for his courage, yet to look up to Anaxarchus as a god is not consistent with reason. He also directs us to Epictetus, whose firmness is justly admired, although his saying when his leg was broken by his master is not to be compared with the marvellous acts and words of Jesus which Celsus refuses to believe; and these words were accompanied by such a divine power, that even to this day they convert not only some of the more ignorant and simple, but many also of the most enlightened of men.

Chapter lv.

When, to his enumeration of those to whom he would send us, he adds, "What saying equal to these did your god utter under sufferings?" we would reply, that the silence of Jesus

under scourgings, and amidst all His sufferings, spoke more for His firmness and submission than all that was said by the Greeks when beset by calamity. Perhaps Celsus may believe what was recorded with all sincerity by trustworthy men, who, while giving a truthful account of all the wonders performed by Jesus, specify among these the silence which He preserved when subjected to scourgings; showing the same singular meekness under the insults which were heaped upon Him, when they put upon Him the purple robe, and set the crown of thorns upon His head, and when they put in His hand a reed in place of a sceptre: no unworthy or angry word escaped Him against those who subjected Him to such outrages. Since, then, He received the scourgings with silent firmness, and bore with meekness all the insults of those who outraged Him, it cannot be said, as is said by some, that it was in cowardly weakness that He uttered the words: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt."[1] The prayer which seems to be contained in these words for the removal of what He calls "the cup" bears a sense which we have elsewhere examined and set forth at large. But taking it in its more obvious sense, consider if it be not a prayer offered to God with all piety. For no man naturally regards anything which may befall him as necessary and inevitable; though he may submit to what is not inevitable, if occasion requires. Besides, these words, "nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt," are not the language of one who yielded to necessity, but of one who was contented with what was befalling Him, and who submitted with reverence to the arrangements of Providence.

Chapter lvi.

Celsus then adds, for what reason I know not, that instead of calling Jesus the Son of God, we had better have given that honour to the Sibyl, in whose books he maintains we have interpolated many impious statements, though he does not mention what those interpolations are. He might have proved his assertion by producing some older copies which are free from the interpolations which he attributes to us; but he does not

[1] Matt. xxvi. 39.

do so even to justify his statement that these passages are of an impious character. Moreover, he again speaks of the life of Jesus as "a most infamous life," as he has done before, not once or twice, but many times, although he does not stay to specify any of the actions of His life which he thinks most infamous. He seems to think that he may in this way make assertions without proving them, and rail against one of whom he knows nothing. Had he set himself to show what sort of infamy he found in the actions of Jesus, we should have repelled the several charges brought against Him. Jesus did indeed meet with a most sad death; but the same might be said of Socrates, and of Anaxarchus, whom he had just mentioned, and a multitude of others. If the death of Jesus was a miserable one, was not that of the others so too? And if their death was not miserable, can it be said that the death of Jesus was? You see from this, then, that the object of Celsus is to vilify the character of Jesus; and I can only suppose that he is driven to it by some spirit akin to those whose power has been broken and vanquished by Jesus, and which now finds itself deprived of the smoke and blood on which it lived, whilst deceiving those who sought for God here upon earth in images, instead of looking up to the true God, the Governor of all things.

Chapter lvii.

After this, as though his object was to swell the size of his book, he advises us "to choose Jonah rather than Jesus as our God;" thus setting Jonah, who preached repentance to the single city of Nineveh, before Jesus, who has preached repentance to the whole world, and with much greater results. He would have us to regard as God a man who, by a strange miracle, passed three days and three nights in the whale's belly; and he is unwilling that He who submitted to death for the sake of men, He to whom God bore testimony through the prophets, and who has done great things in heaven and earth, should receive on that ground honour second only to that which is given to the Most High God. Moreover, Jonah was swallowed by the whale for refusing to preach as God had commanded him; while Jesus suffered death for men after He had given the instructions which God wished Him to give. Still further,

he adds that Daniel rescued from the lions is more worthy of our adoration than Jesus, who subdued the fierceness of every opposing power, and gave to us "authority to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy."[1] Finally, having no other names to offer us, he adds, "and others of a still more monstrous kind,"—thus casting a slight upon both Jonah and Daniel; for the spirit which is in Celsus cannot speak well of the righteous.

Chapter LVIII.

Let us now consider what follows. "They have also," says he, "a precept to this effect, that we ought not to avenge ourselves on one who injures us, or, as he expresses it, 'Whosoever shall strike thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also.' This is an ancient saying, which had been admirably expressed long before, and which they have only reported in a coarser way. For Plato introduces Socrates conversing with Crito as follows: 'Must we never do injustice to any?' 'Certainly not.' 'And since we must never do injustice, must we not return injustice for an injustice that has been done to us, as most people think?' 'It seems to me that we should not.' 'But tell me, Crito, may we do evil to any one or not?' 'Certainly not, O Socrates.' 'Well, is it just, as is commonly said, for one who has suffered wrong to do wrong in return, or is it unjust?' 'It is unjust. Yes; for to do harm to a man is the same as to do him injustice.' 'You speak truly. We must then not do injustice in return for injustice, nor must we do evil to any one, whatever evil we may have suffered from him.' Thus Plato speaks; and he adds, 'Consider, then, whether you are at one with me, and whether, starting from this principle, we may not come to the conclusion that it is never right to do injustice, even in return for an injustice which has been received; or whether, on the other hand, you differ from me, and do not admit the principle from which we started. That has always been my opinion, and is so still.'[2] Such are the sentiments of Plato, and indeed they were held by divine men before his time. But let this suffice as one example of the way in which this and other truths have been borrowed and cor-

[1] Luke x. 19.

[2] Plato's *Crito*, p. 49.

rupted. Any one who wishes can easily by searching find more of them."

Chapter LIX.

When Celsus here or elsewhere finds himself unable to dispute the truth of what we say, but avers that the same things were said by the Greeks, our answer is, that if the doctrine be sound, and the effect of it good, whether it was made known to the Greeks by Plato or any of the wise men of Greece, or whether it was delivered to the Jews by Moses or any of the prophets, or whether it was given to the Christians in the recorded teaching of Jesus Christ, or in the instructions of His apostles, that does not affect the value of the truth communicated. It is no objection to the principles of Jews or Christians, that the same things were also said by the Greeks, especially if it be proved that the writings of the Jews are older than those of the Greeks. And further, we are not to imagine that a truth adorned with the graces of Grecian speech is necessarily better than the same when expressed in the more humble and unpretending language used by Jews and Christians, although indeed the language of the Jews, in which the prophets wrote the books which have come down to us, has a grace of expression peculiar to the genius of the Hebrew tongue. And even if we were required to show that the same doctrines have been better expressed among the Jewish prophets or in Christian writings, however paradoxical it may seem, we are prepared to prove this by an illustration taken from different kinds of food, and from the different modes of preparing them. Suppose that a kind of food which is wholesome and nutritious has been prepared and seasoned in such a way as to be fit, not for the simple tastes of peasants and poor labourers, but for those only who are rich and dainty in their tastes. Suppose, again, that that same food is prepared not to suit the tastes of the more delicate, but for the peasants, the poor labourers, and the common people generally, in short, so that myriads of persons might eat of it. Now if, according to the supposition, the food prepared in the one way promotes the health of those only who are styled the better classes, while none of the others could taste it, whereas when prepared in the other way it promoted

the health of great multitudes of men, which shall we esteem as most contributing to the public welfare,—those who prepare food for persons of mark, or those who prepare it for the multitudes?—taking for granted that in both cases the food is equally wholesome and nourishing; while it is evident that the welfare of mankind and the common good are promoted better by that physician who attends to the health of the many, than by one who confines his attention to a few.

Chapter lx.

Now, after understanding this illustration, we have to apply it to the qualities of spiritual food with which the rational part of man is nourished. See, then, if Plato and the wise men among the Greeks, in the beautiful things they say, are not like those physicians who confine their attentions to what are called the better classes of society, and despise the multitude; whereas the prophets among the Jews, and the disciples of Jesus, who despise mere elegances of style, and what is called in Scripture "the wisdom of men," "the wisdom according to the flesh," which delights in what is obscure, resemble those who study to provide the most wholesome food for the largest number of persons. For this purpose they adapt their language and style to the capacities of the common people, and avoid whatever would seem foreign to them, lest by the introduction of strange forms of expression they should produce a distaste for their teaching. Indeed, if the true use of spiritual food, to keep up the figure, is to produce in him who partakes of it the virtues of patience and gentleness, must that discourse not be better prepared when it produces patience and gentleness in multitudes, or makes them grow in these virtues, than that which confines its effects to a select few, supposing that it does really make them gentle and patient? If a Greek wished by wholesome instruction to benefit people who understood only Egyptian or Syriac, the first thing that he would do would be to learn their language; and he would rather pass for a barbarian among the Greeks, by speaking as the Egyptians or Syrians, in order to be useful to them, than always remain Greek, and be without the means of helping them. In the same way the divine nature, having the purpose of instructing

not only those who are reputed to be learned in the literature of Greece, but also the rest of mankind, accommodated itself to the capacities of the simple multitudes whom it addressed. It seeks to win the attention of the more ignorant by the use of language which is familiar to them, so that they may easily be induced, after their first introduction, to strive after an acquaintance with the deeper truths which lie hidden in Scripture. For even the ordinary reader of Scripture may see that it contains many things which are too deep to be apprehended at first; but these are understood by such as devote themselves to a careful study of the divine word, and they become plain to them in proportion to the pains and zeal which they expend upon its investigation.

Chapter lxi.

From these remarks it is evident, that when Jesus said "coarsely," as Celsus terms it, "To him who shall strike thee on the one cheek, turn the other also; and if any man be minded to sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also,"[1] He expressed Himself in such a way as to make the precept have more practical effect than the words of Plato in the *Crito;* for the latter is so far from being intelligible to ordinary persons, that even those have a difficulty in understanding him, who have been brought up in the schools of learning, and have been initiated into the famous philosophy of Greece. It may also be observed, that the precept enjoining patience under injuries is in no way corrupted or degraded by the plain and simple language which our Lord employs, but that in this, as in other cases, it is a mere calumny against our religion which he utters when he says: "But let this suffice as one example of the way in which this and other truths have been borrowed and corrupted. Any one who wishes can easily by searching find more of them."

Chapter lxii.

Let us now see what follows. "Let us pass on," says he, "to another point. They cannot tolerate temples, altars, or images. In this they are like the Scythians, the nomadic tribes of Libya,

[1] Matt. v. 39, 40.

the Seres who worship no god, and some other of the most barbarous and impious nations in the world. That the Persians hold the same notions is shown by Herodotus in these words: 'I know that among the Persians it is considered unlawful to erect images, altars, or temples; but they charge those with folly who do so, because, as I conjecture, they do not, like the Greeks, suppose the gods to be of the nature of men.'[1] Heraclitus also says in one place: 'Persons who address prayers to these images act like those who speak to the walls, without knowing who the gods or the heroes are.' And what wiser lesson have they to teach us than Heraclitus? He certainly plainly enough implies that it is a foolish thing for a man to offer prayers to images, whilst he knows not who the gods and heroes are. This is the opinion of Heraclitus; but as for them, they go further, and despise without exception all images. If they merely mean that the stone, wood, brass, or gold which has been wrought by this or that workman cannot be a god, they are ridiculous with their wisdom. For who, unless he be utterly childish in his simplicity, can take these for gods, and not for offerings consecrated to the service of the gods, or images representing them? But if we are not to regard these as representing the Divine Being, seeing that God has a different form, as the Persians concur with them in saying, then let them take care that they do not contradict themselves; for they say that God made man His own image, and that He gave him a form like to Himself. However, they will admit that these images, whether they are like or not, are made and dedicated to the honour of certain beings. But they will hold that the beings to whom they are dedicated are not gods, but demons, and that a worshipper of God ought not to worship demons."

Chapter LXIII.

To this our answer is, that if the Scythians, the nomadic tribes of Libya, the Seres, who according to Celsus have no god, if those other most barbarous and impious nations in the world, and if the Persians even cannot bear the sight of temples, altars, and images, it does not follow because we cannot suffer them any more than they, that the grounds on which we object

[1] Herod. i. 131.

to them are the same as theirs. We must inquire into the principles on which the objection to temples and images is founded, in order that we may approve of those who object on sound principles, and condemn those whose principles are false. For one and the same thing may be done for different reasons. For example, the philosophers who follow Zeno of Citium abstain from committing adultery, the followers of Epicurus do so too, as well as others again who do so on no philosophical principles; but observe what different reasons determine the conduct of these different classes. The first consider the interests of society, and hold it to be forbidden by nature that a man who is a reasonable being should corrupt a woman whom the laws have already given to another, and should thus break up the household of another man. The Epicureans do not reason in this way; but if they abstain from adultery, it is because, regarding pleasure as the chief end of man, they perceive that one who gives himself up to adultery, encounters for the sake of this one pleasure a multitude of obstacles to pleasure, such as imprisonment, exile, and death itself. They often, indeed, run considerable risk at the outset, while watching for the departure from the house of the master and those in his interest. So that, supposing it possible for a man to commit adultery, and escape the knowledge of the husband, of his servants, and of others whose esteem he would forfeit, then the Epicurean would yield to the commission of the crime for the sake of pleasure. The man of no philosophical system, again, who abstains from adultery when the opportunity comes to him, does so generally from dread of the law and its penalties, and not for the sake of enjoying a greater number of other pleasures. You see, then, that an act which passes for being one and the same—namely, abstinence from adultery—is not the same, but differs in different men according to the motives which actuate it: one man refraining for sound reasons, another for such bad and impious ones as those of the Epicurean, and the common person of whom we have spoken.

Chapter LXIV.

As, then, this act of self-restraint, which in appearance is one and the same, is found in fact to be different in different

persons, according to the principles and motives which lead to it; so in the same way with those who cannot allow in the worship of the Divine Being altars, or temples, or images. The Scythians, the nomadic Libyans, the godless Seres, and the Persians, agree in this with the Christians and Jews, but they are actuated by very different principles. For none of these former abhor altars and images on the ground that they are afraid of degrading the worship of God, and reducing it to the worship of material things wrought by the hands of men. Neither do they object to them from a belief that the demons choose certain forms and places, whether because they are detained there by virtue of certain charms, or because for some other possible reason they have selected these haunts, where they may pursue their criminal pleasures, in partaking of the smoke of sacrificial victims. But Christians and Jews have regard to this command, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve Him alone;"[1] and this other, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me: thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them;"[2] and again, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."[3] It is in consideration of these and many other such commands, that they not only avoid temples, altars, and images, but are ready to suffer death when it is necessary, rather than debase by any such impiety the conception which they have of the Most High God.

Chapter lxv.

In regard to the Persians, we have already said that though they do not build temples, yet they worship the sun and the other works of God. This is forbidden to us, for we have been taught not to worship the creature instead of the Creator, but to know that "the creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God;" and "the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God;" and "the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason

[1] Deut. vi. 13. [2] Ex. xx. 3, 4. [3] Matt. iv. 10.

of him who made it subject, in hope."[1] We believe, therefore, that things "under the bondage of corruption," and "subject to vanity," which remain in this condition "in hope" of a better state, ought not in our worship to hold the place of God, the all-sufficient, and of His Son, the first-born of all creation. Let this suffice, in addition to what we have already said of the Persians, who abhor altars and images, but who serve the creature instead of the Creator. As to the passage quoted by Celsus from Heraclitus, the purport of which he represents as being, "that it is childish folly for one to offer prayers to images, whilst he knows not who the gods and heroes are," we may reply that it is easy to know that God and the only-begotten Son of God, and those whom God has honoured with the title of God, and who partake of His divine nature, are very different from all the gods of the nations which are demons; but it is not possible at the same time to know God and to address prayers to images.

Chapter lxvi.

And the charge of folly applies not only to those who offer prayers to images, but also to such as pretend to do so in compliance with the example of the multitude: and to this class belong the Peripatetic philosophers and the followers of Epicurus and Democritus. For there is no falsehood or pretence in the soul which is possessed with true piety towards God. Another reason also why we abstain from doing honour to images, is that we may give no support to the notion that the images are gods. It is on this ground that we condemn Celsus, and all others who, while admitting that they are not gods, yet, with the reputation of being wise men, render to them what passes for homage. In this way they lead into sin the multitude who follow their example, and who worship these images not simply out of deference to custom, but from a belief into which they have fallen that they are true gods, and that those are not to be listened to who hold that the objects of their worship are not true gods. Celsus, indeed, says that "they do not take them for gods, but only as offerings dedicated to the gods." But he does not prove that they are not rather

[1] Rom. viii. 19–21.

dedicated to men than, as he says, to the honour of the gods themselves; for it is clear that they are the offerings of men who were in error in their views of the Divine Being. Moreover, we do not imagine that these images are representations of God, for they cannot represent a being who is invisible and incorporeal. But as Celsus supposes that we fall into a contradiction, whilst on the one hand we say that God has not a human form, and on the other we profess to believe that God made man the image of Himself, and created man the image of God; our answer is the same as has been given already, that we hold the resemblance to God to be preserved in the reasonable soul, which is formed to virtue, although Celsus, who does not see the difference between "being the image of God," and "being created after the image of God," pretends that we said, "God made man His own image, and gave him a form like to His own." But this also has been examined before.

Chapter LXVII.

His next remark upon the Christians is: "They will admit that these images, whether they are like or not, are made and dedicated to the honour of certain beings; but they will hold that the beings to whom they are dedicated are not gods, but demons, and that a worshipper of God ought not to worship demons." If he had been acquainted with the nature of demons, and with their several operations, whether led on to them by the conjurations of those who are skilled in the art, or urged on by their own inclination to act according to their power and inclination; if, I say, he had thoroughly understood this subject, which is both wide in extent and difficult for human comprehension, he would not have condemned us for saying that those who worship the Supreme Being should not serve demons. For ourselves, so far are we from wishing to serve demons, that by the use of prayers and other means which we learn from Scripture, we drive them out of the souls of men, out of places where they have established themselves, and even sometimes from the bodies of animals; for even these creatures often suffer from injuries inflicted upon them by demons.

Chapter LXVIII.

After all that we have already said concerning Jesus, it would be a useless repetition for us to answer these words of Celsus: "It is easy to convict them of worshipping not a god, not even demons, but a dead person." Leaving, then, this objection for the reason assigned, let us pass on to what follows: "In the first place, I would ask why we are not to serve demons? Is it not true that all things are ordered according to God's will, and that His providence governs all things? Is not everything which happens in the universe, whether it be the work of God, of angels, of other demons, or of heroes, regulated by the law of the Most High God? Have these not had assigned them various departments of which they were severally deemed worthy? Is it not just, therefore, that he who worships God should serve those also to whom God has assigned such power? Yet it is impossible, he says, for a man to serve many masters." Observe here again how he settles at once a number of questions which require considerable research, and a profound acquaintance with what is most mysterious in the government of the universe. For we must inquire into the meaning of the statement, that "all things are ordered according to God's will," and ascertain whether sins are or are not included among the things which God orders. For if God's government extends to sins not only in men, but also in demons and in any other spiritual beings who are capable of sin, it is for those who speak in this manner to see how inconvenient is the expression that "all things are ordered by the will of God." For it follows from it that all sins and all their consequences are ordered by the will of God, which is a different thing from saying that they come to pass with God's permission. For if we take the word "ordered" in its proper signification, and say that "all the results of sin were ordered," then it is evident that all things are ordered according to God's will, and that all, therefore, who do evil do not offend against His government. And the same distinction holds in regard to "providence." When we say that "the providence of God regulates all things," we utter a great truth if we attribute to that providence nothing but what is just and right. But if we ascribe to the

providence of God all things whatsoever, however unjust they may be, then it is no longer true that the providence of God regulates all things, unless we refer directly to God's providence things which flow as results from His arrangements. Celsus maintains also, that "whatever happens in the universe, whether it be the work of God, of angels, of other demons, or of heroes, is regulated by the law of the Most High God." But this also is incorrect; for we cannot say that transgressors follow the law of God when they transgress; and Scripture declares that it is not only wicked men who are transgressors, but also wicked demons and wicked angels.

Chapter LXIX.

And it is not we alone who speak of wicked demons, but almost all who acknowledge the existence of demons. Thus, then, it is not true that all observe the law of the Most High; for all who fall away from the divine law, whether through heedlessness, or through depravity and vice, or through ignorance of what is right, all such do not keep the law of God, but, to use a new phrase which we find in Scripture, "the law of sin." I say, then, that in the opinion of most of those who believe in the existence of demons, some of them are wicked; and these, instead of keeping the law of God, offend against it. But, according to our belief, it is true of all demons, that they were not demons originally, but they became so in departing from the true way; so that the name "demons" is given to those beings who have fallen away from God. Accordingly, those who worship God must not serve demons. We may also learn the true nature of demons if we consider the practice of those who call upon them by charms to prevent certain things, or for many other purposes. For this is the method they adopt, in order by means of incantations and magical arts to invoke the demons, and induce them to further their wishes. Wherefore the worship of all demons would be inconsistent in us who worship the supreme God; and the service of demons is the service of so-called gods, for "all the gods of the heathen are demons."[1] The same thing also appears from the fact that the dedication of the most famous of the so-called sacred places,

[1] Ps. xcvi. 5 (LXX.).

whether temples or statues, was accompanied by curious magical incantations, which were performed by those who zealously served the demons with magical arts. Hence we are determined to avoid the worship of demons even as we would avoid death; and we hold that the worship, which is supposed among the Greeks to be rendered to gods at the altars, and images, and temples, is in reality offered to demons.

Chapter lxx.

His next remark was, "Have not these inferior powers had assigned to them by God different departments, according as each was deemed worthy?" But this is a question which requires a very profound knowledge. For we must determine whether the Word of God, who governs all things, has appointed wicked demons for certain employments, in the same way as in states executioners are appointed, and other officers with cruel but needful duties to discharge; or whether as among robbers, who infest desert places, it is customary for them to choose out of their number one who may be their leader,—so the demons, who are scattered as it were in troops in different parts of the earth, have chosen for themselves a chief under whose command they may plunder and pillage the souls of men. To explain this fully, and to justify the conduct of the Christians in refusing homage to any object except the Most High God, and the First-born of all creation, who is His Word and God, we must quote this from Scripture, "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them;" and again, "The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy;"[1] and other similar passages, as, "Behold, I have given you authority to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you;"[2] and again, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet."[3] But of these things Celsus knew nothing, or he would not have made use of language like this: "Is not everything which happens in the universe, whether it be the work of God, of angels, of other demons, or of heroes, regulated by the law of the Most High God? Have these not

[1] John x. 8-10. [2] Luke x. 19. [3] Ps. xci. 13.

had assigned to them various departments of which they were severally deemed worthy? Is it not just, therefore, that he who serves God should serve those also to whom God has assigned such power?" To which he adds, "It is impossible, they say, for a man to serve many masters." This last point we must postpone to the next book; for this, which is the seventh book which we have written in answer to the treatise of Celsus, is already of sufficient length.

BOOK VIII.

Chapter I.

HAVING completed seven books, I now propose to begin the eighth. And may God and His only-begotten Son the Word be with us, to enable us effectively to refute the falsehoods which Celsus has published under the delusive title of *A True Discourse*, and at the same time to unfold the truths of Christianity with such fulness as our purpose requires. And as Paul said, "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us,"[1] so would we in the same spirit and language earnestly desire to be ambassadors for Christ to men, even as the Word of God beseeches them to the love of Himself, seeking to win over to righteousness, truth, and the other virtues, those who, until they receive the doctrines of Jesus Christ, live in darkness about God and in ignorance of their Creator. Again, then, I would say, may God bestow upon us His pure and true Word, even "the Lord strong and mighty in battle"[2] against sin. We must now proceed to state the next objection of Celsus, and afterwards to answer it.

Chapter II.

In a passage previously quoted Celsus asks us why we do not worship demons, and to his remarks on demons we gave such an answer as seemed to us in accordance with the divine word. After having put this question for the purpose of leading us to the worship of demons, he represents us as answering that it is impossible to serve many masters. "This," he goes on to say, "is the language of sedition, and is only used by those who separate themselves and stand aloof from all human society. Those who speak in this way ascribe," as he supposes, "their

[1] 2 Cor. v. 20. [2] Ps. xxiv. 8.

own feelings and passions to God. It does hold true among men, that he who is in the service of one master cannot well serve another, because the service which he renders to the one interferes with that which he owes to the other; and no one, therefore, who has already engaged himself to the service of one, must accept that of another. And, in like manner, it is impossible to serve at the same time heroes or demons of different natures. But in regard to God, who is subject to no suffering or loss, it is," he thinks, "absurd to be on our guard against serving more gods, as though we had to do with demi-gods, or other spirits of that sort." He says also, "He who serves many gods does that which is pleasing to the Most High, because he honours that which belongs to Him." And he adds, "It is indeed wrong to give honour to any to whom God has not given honour." "Wherefore," he says, "in honouring and worshipping all belonging to God, we will not displease Him to whom they all belong."

Chapter III.

Before proceeding to the next point, it may be well for us to see whether we do not accept with approval the saying, "No man can serve two masters," with the addition, "for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other," and further, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."[1] The defence of this passage will lead us to a deeper and more searching inquiry into the meaning and application of the words "gods" and "lords." Divine Scripture teaches us that there is "a great Lord above all gods."[2] And by this name "gods" we are not to understand the objects of heathen worship (for we know that "all the gods of the heathen are demons"[3]), but the gods mentioned by the prophets as forming an assembly, whom God "judges," and to each of whom He assigns his proper work. For "God standeth in the assembly of the gods: He judgeth among the gods."[4] For "God is Lord of gods," who by His Son "hath called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof."[5] We are also commanded to "give thanks to the God of gods."[6]

[1] Matt. vi. 24. [2] Ps. xcvii. 9. [3] Ps. xcvi. 5.
[4] Ps. lxxxii. 1. [5] Ps. l. 1. [6] Ps. cxxxvi. 2.

Moreover, we are taught that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."[1] Nor are these the only passages to this effect; but there are very many others.

Chapter IV.

The sacred Scriptures teach us to think, in like manner, of the Lord of lords. For they say in one place, "Give thanks to the God of gods, for His mercy endureth for ever. Give thanks to the Lord of lords, for His mercy endureth for ever;" and in another, "God is King of kings, and Lord of lords." For Scripture distinguishes between those gods which are such only in name and those which are truly gods, whether they are called by that name or not; and the same is true in regard to the use of the word "lords." To this effect Paul says, "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there are gods many, and lords many."[2] But as the God of gods calls whom He pleases through Jesus to his inheritance, "from the east and from the west," and the Christ of God thus shows His superiority to all rulers by entering into their several provinces, and summoning men out of them to be subject to Himself, Paul therefore, with this in view, goes on to say, "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him;" adding, as if with a deep sense of the marvellous and mysterious nature of the doctrine, "Howbeit, there is not in every man that knowledge." When he says, "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things," by "us" he means himself and all those who have risen up to the supreme God of gods and to the supreme Lord of lords. Now he has risen to the supreme God who gives Him an entire and undivided worship through His Son—the word and wisdom of God made manifest in Jesus. For it is the Son alone who leads to God those who are striving, by the purity of their thoughts, words, and deeds, to come near to God the Creator of the universe. I think, therefore, that the prince of this world, who "transforms himself into an angel of light,"[3] was referring to this and such like statements in the words,

[1] Matt. xxii. 32. [2] 1 Cor. viii. 5, etc. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 14.

"Him follows a host of gods and demons, arranged in eleven bands." Speaking of himself and the philosophers, he says, "We are of the party of Jupiter; others belong to other demons."[1]

Chapter v.

Whilst there are thus many gods and lords, whereof some are such in reality, and others are such only in name, we strive to rise not only above those whom the nations of the earth worship as gods, but also beyond those spoken of as gods in Scripture, of whom they are wholly ignorant who are strangers to the covenants of God given by Moses and by our Saviour Jesus, and who have no part in the promises which He has made to us through them. That man rises above all demon-worship who does nothing that is pleasing to demons; and he rises to a blessedness beyond that of those whom Paul calls "gods," if he is enabled, like them, or in any way he may, "to look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are unseen." And he who considers that "the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope," whilst he praises the creature, and sees how "it shall be freed altogether from the bondage of corruption, and restored to the glorious liberty of the children of God,"[2]—such a one cannot be induced to combine with the service of God the service of any other, or to serve two masters. There is therefore nothing seditious or factious in the language of those who hold these views, and who refuse to serve more masters than one. To them Jesus Christ is an all-sufficient Lord, who Himself instructs them, in order that when fully instructed He may form them into a kingdom worthy of God, and present them to God the Father. But indeed they do in a sense separate themselves and stand aloof from those who are aliens from the commonwealth of God and strangers to His covenants, in order that they may live as citizens of heaven, "coming to the living God, and to the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."[3]

[1] Plato, *Phædrus*, p. 246. [2] Rom. viii. 19, 20. [3] Heb. xii. 22, 23.

Chapter vi.

But when we refuse to serve any other than God through His word and wisdom, we do so, not as though we would thereby be doing any harm or injury to God, in the same way as injury would be done to a man by his servant entering into the service of another, but we fear that we ourselves should suffer harm by depriving ourselves of our portion in God, through which we live in the participation of the divine blessedness, and are imbued with that excellent spirit of adoption which in the sons of the heavenly Father cries, not with words, but with deep effect in the inmost heart, "Abba, Father." The Lacedæmonian ambassadors, when brought before the king of Persia, refused to prostrate themselves before him, when the attendants endeavoured to compel them to do so, out of respect for that which alone had authority and lordship over them, namely, the law of Lycurgus.[1] But they who have a much greater and diviner embassy in "being ambassadors for Christ" should not worship any ruler among Persians, or Greeks, or Egyptians, or of any nation whatever, even although their officers and ministers, demons and angels of the devil, should seek to compel them to do so, and should urge them to set at nought a law which is mightier than all the laws upon earth. For the Lord of those who are "ambassadors for Christ" is Christ Himself, whose ambassadors they are, and who is "the Word, who was in the beginning, was with God, and was God."[2]

Chapter vii.

But when Celsus speaks of heroes and demons, he starts a deeper question than he is aware of. For after the statement which he made in regard to service among men, that "the first master is injured when any of his servants wishes at the same time to serve another," he adds, that "the same holds true of heroes, and other demons of that kind." Now we must inquire of him what nature he thinks those heroes and demons possess of whom he affirms that he who serves one hero may not serve another, and he who serves one demon may not serve another, as though the former hero or demon would be injured

[1] Herod. vii. 136. [2] John i. 1.

in the same way as men are injured when they who serve them first afterwards give themselves to the service of others. Let him also state what loss he supposes those heroes or demons will suffer. For he will be driven either to plunge into endless absurdities, and first repeat, then retract his previous statements; or else to abandon his frivolous conjectures, and confess that he understands nothing of the nature of heroes and demons. And in regard to his statement, that men suffer injury when the servant of one man enters the service of a second master, the question arises: "What is the nature of the injury which is done to the former master by a servant who, while serving him, wishes at the same time to serve another?"

Chapter VIII.

For if he answers, as one who is unlearned and ignorant of philosophy, that the injury sustained is one which regards things that are outside of us, it will be plainly manifest that he knows nothing of that famous saying of Socrates, "Anytus and Melitus may kill me, but they cannot injure me; for it is impossible that the better should ever be injured by the worse." But if by injury he means a wicked impulse or an evil habit, it is plain that no injury of this kind would befall the wise, by one man serving two wise men in different places. If this sense does not suit his purpose, it is evident that his endeavours are vain to weaken the authority of the passage, "No man can serve two masters;" for these words can be perfectly true only when they refer to the service which we render to the Most High through His Son, who leadeth us to God. And we will not serve God as though He stood in need of our service, or as though He would be made unhappy if we ceased to serve Him; but we do it because we are ourselves benefited by the service of God, and because we are freed from griefs and troubles by serving the Most High God through His only begotten Son, the Word and Wisdom.

Chapter IX.

And observe the recklessness of that expression, "For if thou worship any other of the things in the universe," as though he would have us believe that we are led by our service of God

to the worship of any other things which belong to God, without any injury to ourselves. But, as if feeling his error, he corrects the words, "If thou worship any other of the things in the universe," by adding, "We may honour none, however, except those to whom that right has been given by God." And we would put to Celsus this question in regard to those who are honoured as gods, as demons, or as heroes: "Now, sir, can you prove that the right to be honoured has been given to these by God, and that it has not arisen from the ignorance and folly of men who in their wanderings have fallen away from Him to whom alone worship and service are properly due? You said a little ago, O Celsus, that Antinous, the favourite of Adrian, is honoured; but surely you will not say that the right to be worshipped as a god was given to him by the God of the universe? And so of the others, we ask proof that the right to be worshipped was given to them by the Most High God." But if the same question is put to us in regard to the worship of Jesus, we will show that the right to be honoured was given to Him by God, "that all may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."[1] For all the prophecies which preceded His birth were preparations for His worship. And the wonders which He wrought—through no magical art, as Celsus supposes, but by a divine power, which was foretold by the prophets—have served as a testimony from God in behalf of the worship of Christ. He who honours the Son, who is the Word and Reason, acts in nowise contrary to reason, and gains for himself great good; he who honours Him, who is the Truth, becomes better by honouring truth: and this we may say of honouring wisdom, righteousness, and all the other names by which the sacred Scriptures are wont to designate the Son of God.

Chapter X.

But that the honour which we pay to the Son of God, as well as that which we render to God the Father, consists of an upright course of life, is plainly taught us by the passage, "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?"[2] and also, "Of how much sorer

[1] John v. 23.

[2] Rom. ii. 23.

punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"[1] For if he who transgresses the law dishonours God by his transgression, and he who treads under foot the word treads under foot the Son of God, it is evident that he who keeps the law honours God, and that the worshipper of God is he whose life is regulated by the principles and precepts of the divine word. Had Celsus known who they are who are God's people, and that they alone are wise,—and who they are who are strangers to God, and that these are all the wicked who have no desire to give themselves to virtue,—he would have considered before he gave expression to the words, "How can he who honours any of those whom God acknowledges as His own be displeasing to God, to whom they all belong?"

Chapter XI.

He adds, "And indeed he who, when speaking of God, asserts that there is only one who may be called Lord, speaks impiously, for he divides the kingdom of God, and raises a sedition therein, implying that there are separate factions in the divine kingdom, and that there exists one who is His enemy." He might speak after this fashion, if he could prove by conclusive arguments that those who are worshipped as gods by the heathens are truly gods, and not merely evil spirits, which are supposed to haunt statues and temples and altars. But we desire not only to understand the nature of that divine kingdom of which we are continually speaking and writing, but also ourselves to be of those who are under the rule of God alone, so that the kingdom of God may be ours. Celsus, however, who teaches us to worship many gods, ought in consistency not to speak of "the kingdom of God," but of "the kingdom of the gods." There are therefore no factions in the kingdom of God, nor is there any god who is an adversary to Him, although there are some who, like the giants and Titans, in their wickedness wish to contend with God in company with Celsus, and those who declare war against Him who has by in-

[1] Heb. x. 29.

numerable proofs established the claims of Jesus, and against Him who, as the Word, did, for the salvation of our race, show Himself before all the world in such a form as each was able to receive Him.

Chapter xii.

In what follows, some may imagine that he says something plausible against us. "If," says he, "these people worshipped one God alone, and no other, they would perhaps have some valid argument against the worship of others. But they pay excessive reverence to one who has but lately appeared among men, and they think it no offence against God if they worship also His servant." To this we reply, that if Celsus had known that saying, "I and my Father are one,"[1] and the words used in prayer by the Son of God, "As Thou and I are one,"[2] he would not have supposed that we worship any other besides Him who is the supreme God. "For," says He, "my Father is in me, and I in Him."[3] And if any should from these words be afraid of our going over to the side of those who deny that the Father and the Son are two persons, let him weigh that passage, "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul,"[4] that he may understand the meaning of the saying, "I and my Father are one." We worship one God, the Father and the Son, therefore, as we have explained; and our argument against the worship of other gods still continues valid. And we do not "reverence beyond measure one who has but lately appeared," as though He did not exist before; for we believe Himself when He says, "Before Abraham was, I am."[5] Again He says, "I am the truth;"[6] and surely none of us is so simple as to suppose that truth did not exist before the time when Christ appeared. We worship, therefore, the Father of truth, and the Son, who is the truth; and these, while they are two, considered as persons or subsistences, are one in unity of thought, in harmony and in identity of will. So entirely are they one, that he who has seen the Son, "who is the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of His person,"[7] has seen in Him who is the image of God, God Himself.

[1] John x. 30. [2] John xvii. 22. [3] John xiv. 11, and xvii. 21.
[4] Acts iv. 32. [5] John viii. 58. [6] John xiv. 6. [7] Heb. i. 3.

Chapter XIII.

He further supposes, that "because we join along with the worship of God the worship of His Son, it follows that, in our view, not only God, but also the servants of God, are to be worshipped." If he had meant this to apply to those who are truly the servants of God, after His only-begotten Son,—to Gabriel and Michael, and the other angels and archangels,—and if he had said of these that they ought to be worshipped,—if also he had clearly defined the meaning of the word "worship," and the duties of the worshippers,—we might perhaps have brought forward such thoughts as have occurred to us on so important a subject. But as he reckons among the servants of God the demons which are worshipped by the heathen, he cannot induce us, on the plea of consistency, to worship such as are declared by the word to be servants of the evil one, the prince of this world, who leads astray from God as many as he can. We decline, therefore, altogether to worship and serve those whom other men worship, for the reason that they are not servants of God. For if we had been taught to regard them as servants of the Most High, we would not have called them demons. Accordingly, we worship with all our power the one God, and His only Son, the Word and the Image of God, by prayers and supplications; and we offer our petitions to the God of the universe through His only-begotten Son. To the Son we first present them, and beseech Him, as "the propitiation for our sins,"[1] and our High Priest, to offer our desires, and sacrifices, and prayers, to the Most High. Our faith, therefore, is directed to God through His Son, who strengthens it in us; and Celsus can never show that the Son of God is the cause of any sedition or disloyalty in the kingdom of God. We honour the Father when we admire His Son, the Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, and all that He who is the Son of so great a Father is said in Scripture to be. So much on this point.

Chapter XIV.

Again Celsus proceeds: "If you should tell them that Jesus is not the Son of God, but that God is the Father of all, and

[1] 1 John ii. 2.

that He alone ought to be truly worshipped, they would not consent to discontinue their worship of him who is their leader in the sedition. And they call him Son of God, not out of any extreme reverence for God, but from an extreme desire to extol Jesus Christ." We, however, have learned who the Son of God is, and know that He is "the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person," and "the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty;" moreover, "the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness."[1] We know, therefore, that He is the Son of God, and that God is His Father. And there is nothing extravagant or unbecoming the character of God in the doctrine that He should have begotten such an only Son; and no one will persuade us that such a one is not a Son of the unbegotten God and Father. If Celsus has heard something of certain persons holding that the Son of God is not the Son of the Creator of the universe, that is a matter which lies between him and the supporters of such an opinion. Jesus is, then, not the leader of any seditious movement, but the promoter of peace. For He said to His disciples, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you;" and as He knew that it would be men of the world, and not men of God, who would wage war against us, he added, "Not as the world giveth peace, do I give peace unto you."[2] And even although we are oppressed in the world, we have confidence in Him who said, "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." And it is He whom we call Son of God—Son of that God, namely, whom, to quote the words of Celsus, "we most highly reverence;" and He is the Son who has been most highly exalted by the Father. Grant that there may be some individuals among the multitudes of believers who are not in entire agreement with us, and who incautiously assert that the Saviour is the Most High God; however, we do not hold with them, but rather believe Him when He says, "The Father who sent me is greater than I."[3] We would not therefore make Him whom we call Father inferior—as Celsus accuses us of doing—to the Son of God.

[1] Wisd. vii. 25, 26. [2] John xiv. 27. [3] John xiv. 28.

Chapter XV.

Celsus goes on to say: "That I may give a true representation of their faith, I will use their own words, as given in what is called *A Heavenly Dialogue:* 'If the Son is mightier than God, and the Son of man is Lord over Him, who else than the Son can be Lord over that God who is the ruler over all things? How comes it, that while so many go about the well, no one goes down into it? Why art thou afraid when thou hast gone so far on the way? Answer: Thou art mistaken, for I lack neither courage nor weapons.' Is it not evident, then, that their views are precisely such as I have described them to be? They suppose that another God, who is above the heavens, is the Father of him whom with one accord they honour, that they may honour this Son of man alone, whom they exalt under the form and name of the great God, and whom they assert to be stronger than God, who rules the world, and that he rules over Him. And hence that maxim of theirs, 'It is impossible to serve two masters,' is maintained for the purpose of keeping up the party who are on the side of this Lord." Here, again, Celsus quotes opinions from some most obscure sect of heretics, and ascribes them to all Christians. I call it "a most obscure sect;" for although we have often contended with heretics, yet we are unable to discover from what set of opinions he has taken this passage, if indeed he has quoted it from any author, and has not rather concocted it himself, or added it as an inference of his own. For we who say that the visible world is under the government of Him who created all things, do thereby declare that the Son is not mightier than the Father, but inferior to Him. And this belief we ground on the saying of Jesus Himself, "The Father who sent me is greater than I." And none of us is so insane as to affirm that the Son of man is Lord over God. But when we regard the Saviour as God the Word, and Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Truth, we certainly do say that He has dominion over all things which have been subjected to Him in this capacity, but not that His dominion extends over the God and Father who is Ruler over all. Besides, as the Word rules over none against their will, there are still wicked beings—not

only men, but also angels, and all demons—over whom we say that in a sense He does not rule, since they do not yield Him a willing obedience; but, in another sense of the word, He rules even over them, in the same way as we say that man rules over the irrational animals,—not by persuasion, but as one who tames and subdues lions and beasts of burden. Nevertheless, He leaves no means untried to persuade even those who are still disobedient to submit to His authority. So far as we are concerned, therefore, we deny the truth of that which Celsus quotes as one of our sayings, "Who else than He can be Lord over Him who is God over all?"

Chapter XVI.

The remaining part of the extract given by Celsus seems to have been taken from some other form of heresy, and the whole jumbled together in strange confusion: "How is it, that while so many go about the well, no one goes down into it? Why dost thou shrink with fear when thou hast gone so far on the way? Answer: Thou art mistaken, for I lack neither courage nor weapons." We who belong to the church which takes its name from Christ, assert that none of these statements are true. For he seems to have made them simply that they might harmonize with what he had said before; but they have no reference to us. For it is a principle with us, not to worship any god whom we merely "suppose" to exist, but Him alone who is the Creator of this universe, and of all things besides which are unseen by the eye of sense. These remarks of Celsus may apply to those who go on another road and tread other paths from us,—men who deny the Creator, and make to themselves another god under a new form, having nothing but the name of God, whom they esteem higher than the Creator; and with these may be joined any that there may be who say that the Son is greater than the God who rules all things. In reference to the precept that we ought not to serve two masters, we have already shown what appears to us the principle contained in it, when we proved that no sedition or disloyalty could be charged against the followers of Jesus their Lord, who confess that they reject every other lord, and serve Him alone who is the Son and Word of God.

Chapter xvii.

Celsus then proceeds to say that "we shrink from raising altars, statues, and temples; and this," he thinks, "has been agreed upon among us as the badge or distinctive mark of a secret and forbidden society." He does not perceive that we regard the spirit of every good man as an altar from which arises an incense which is truly and spiritually sweet-smelling, namely, the prayers ascending from a pure conscience. Therefore it is said by John in the Revelation, "The odours are the prayers of saints;"[1] and by the Psalmist, "Let my prayer come up before Thee as incense."[2] And the statues and gifts which are fit offerings to God are the work of no common mechanics, but are wrought and fashioned in us by the Word of God, to wit, the virtues in which we imitate "the First-born of all creation," who has set us an example of justice, of temperance, of courage, of wisdom, of piety, and of the other virtues. In all those, then, who plant and cultivate within their souls, according to the divine word, temperance, justice, wisdom, piety, and other virtues, these excellences are their statues they raise, in which we are persuaded that it is becoming for us to honour the model and prototype of all statues: "the image of the invisible God," God the only-begotten. And again, they who "put off the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that hath created him," in taking upon them the image of Him who hath created them, do raise within themselves a statue like to what the Most High God Himself desires. And as among statuaries there are some who are marvellously perfect in their art, as for example Pheidias and Polycleitus, and among painters, Zeuxis and Apelles, whilst others make inferior statues, and others, again, are inferior to the second-rate artists,—so that, taking all together, there is a wide difference in the execution of statues and pictures,—in the same way there are some who form images of the Most High in a better manner and with a more perfect skill; so that there is no comparison even between the Olympian Jupiter of Pheidias and the man who has been fashioned according to the image of God the

[1] Rev. v. 8. [2] Ps. cxli. 2.

Creator. But by far the most excellent of all these throughout the whole of creation is that image in our Saviour who said, "My Father is in me."

Chapter xviii.

And every one who imitates Him according to his ability, does by this very endeavour raise a statue according to the image of the Creator, for in the contemplation of God with a pure heart they become imitators of Him. And, in general, we see that all Christians strive to raise altars and statues as we have described them, and these not of a lifeless and senseless kind, and not to receive greedy spirits intent upon lifeless things, but to be filled with the Spirit of God who dwells in the images of virtue of which we have spoken, and takes His abode in the soul which is conformed to the image of the Creator. Thus the Spirit of Christ dwells in those who bear, so to say, a resemblance in form and feature to Himself. And the Word of God, wishing to set this clearly before us, represents God as promising to the righteous, "I will dwell in them, and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."[1] And the Saviour says, "If any man hear my words, and do them, I and my Father will come to him, and make our abode with him."[2] Let any one, therefore, who chooses compare the altars which I have described with those spoken of by Celsus, and the images in the souls of those who worship the Most High God with the statues of Pheidias, Polycleitus, and such like, and he will clearly perceive, that while the latter are lifeless things, and subject to the ravages of time, the former abide in the immortal spirit as long as the reasonable soul wishes to preserve them.

Chapter xix.

And if, further, temples are to be compared with temples, that we may prove to those who accept the opinions of Celsus that we do not object to the erection of temples suited to the images and altars of which we have spoken, but that we do refuse to build lifeless temples to the Giver of all life, let any one who chooses learn how we are taught, that our bodies

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 16. [2] John xiv. 23.

are the temple of God, and that if any one by lust or sin defiles the temple of God, he will himself be destroyed, as acting impiously towards the true temple. Of all the temples spoken of in this sense, the best and most excellent was the pure and holy body of our Saviour Jesus Christ. When He knew that wicked men might aim at the destruction of the temple of God in Him, but that their purposes of destruction would not prevail against the divine power which had built that temple, He says to them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it again. . . . This He said of the temple of His body."[1] And in other parts of holy Scripture where it speaks of the mystery of the resurrection to those whose ears are divinely opened, it says that the temple which has been destroyed shall be built up again of living and most precious stones, thereby giving us to understand that each of those who are led by the word of God to strive together in the duties of piety, will be a precious stone in the one great temple of God. Accordingly, Peter says, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;"[2] and Paul also says, "Being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ our Lord being the chief corner-stone."[3] And there is a similar hidden allusion in this passage in Isaiah, which is addressed to Jerusalem: "Behold, I will lay thy stones with carbuncles, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy battlements of jasper, and thy gates of crystal, and all thy borders of pleasant stones. And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established."[4]

Chapter xx.

There are, then, among the righteous some who are carbuncles, others sapphires, others jaspers, and others crystal, and thus there is among the righteous every kind of choice and precious stone. As to the spiritual meaning of the different stones,—what is their nature, and to what kind of soul the name of each precious stone especially applies,—we cannot at present

[1] John ii. 19, 21.
[2] 1 Pet. ii. 5.
[3] Eph. ii. 20.
[4] Isa. liv. 11–14.

stay to examine. We have only felt it necessary to show thus briefly what we understand by temples, and what the one Temple of God built of precious stones truly means. For as if in some cities a dispute should arise as to which had the finest temples, those who thought their own were the best would do their utmost to show the excellence of their own temples and the inferiority of the others,—in like manner, when they reproach us for not deeming it necessary to worship the Divine Being by raising lifeless temples, we set before them our temples, and show to such at least as are not blind and senseless, like their senseless gods, that there is no comparison between our statues and the statues of the heathen, nor between our altars, with what we may call the incense ascending from them, and the heathen altars, with the fat and blood of the victims; nor, finally, between the temples of senseless gods, admired by senseless men, who have no divine faculty for perceiving God, and the temples, statues, and altars which are worthy of God. It is not therefore true that we object to building altars, statues, and temples, because we have agreed to make this the badge of a secret and forbidden society; but we do so, because we have learnt from Jesus Christ the true way of serving God, and we shrink from whatever, under a pretence of piety, leads to utter impiety those who abandon the way marked out for us by Jesus Christ. For it is He who alone is the way of piety, as He truly said, "I am the way, the truth, the life."

Chapter xxi.

Let us see what Celsus further says of God, and how he urges us to the use of those things which are properly called idol offerings, or, still better, offerings to demons, although, in his ignorance of what true sanctity is, and what sacrifices are well-pleasing to God, he call them "holy sacrifices." His words are, "God is the God of all alike; He is good, He stands in need of nothing, and He is without jealousy. What, then, is there to hinder those who are most devoted to His service from taking part in public feasts?" I cannot see the connection which he fancies between God's being good, and independent, and free from jealousy, and His devoted servants taking part in public feasts. I confess, indeed, that from the fact

that God is good, and without want of anything, and free from jealousy, it would follow as a consequence that we might take part in public feasts, if it were proved that the public feasts had nothing wrong in them, and were grounded upon true views of the character of God, so that they resulted naturally from a devout service of God. If, however, the so-called public festivals can in no way be shown to accord with the service of God, but may on the contrary be proved to have been devised by men when occasion offered to commemorate some human events, or to set forth certain qualities of water or earth, or the fruits of the earth,—in that case, it is clear that those who wish to offer an enlightened worship to the Divine Being will act according to sound reason, and not take part in the public feasts. For "to keep a feast," as one of the wise men of Greece has well said, "is nothing else than to do one's duty;"[1] and that man truly celebrates a feast who does his duty and prays always, offering up continually bloodless sacrifices in prayer to God. That therefore seems to me a most noble saying of Paul, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain."[2]

Chapter XXII.

If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as for example the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words, and deeds serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day. He also who is unceasingly preparing himself for the true life, and abstaining from the pleasures of this life which lead astray so many,—who is not indulging the lust of the flesh, but "keeping under his body, and bringing it into subjection," —such a one is always keeping Preparation-day. Again, he who considers that "Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us," and that it is his duty to keep the feast by eating of the flesh of the Word, never ceases to keep the paschal feast; for the *pascha* means a "passover," and he is ever striving in all his

[1] Thucyd. i. [2] Gal. iv. 10, 11.

thoughts, words, and deeds, to pass over from the things of this life to God, and is hastening towards the city of God. And, finally, he who can truly say, "We are risen with Christ," and "He hath exalted us, and made us to sit with Him in heavenly places in Christ," is always living in the season of Pentecost; and most of all, when going up to the upper chamber, like the apostles of Jesus, he gives himself to supplication and prayer, that he may become worthy of receiving "the mighty wind rushing from heaven," which is powerful to destroy sin and its fruits among men, and worthy of having some share of the tongue of fire which God sends.

Chapter xxiii.

But the majority of those who are accounted believers are not of this advanced class; but from being either unable or unwilling to keep every day in this manner, they require some sensible memorials to prevent spiritual things from passing altogether away from their minds. It is to this practice of setting apart some days distinct from others, that Paul seems to me to refer in the expression, "part of the feast;"[1] and by these words he indicates that a life in accordance with the divine word consists not "in a part of the feast," but in one entire and never-ceasing festival. Again, compare the festivals, observed among us as these have been described above, with the public feasts of Celsus and the heathen, and say if the former are not much more sacred observances than those feasts in which the lust of the flesh runs riot, and leads to drunkenness and debauchery. It would be too long for us at present to show why we are required by the law of God to keep its festivals by eating "the bread of affliction,"[2] or "leaven with bitter herbs,"[3] or why it says, "Humble your souls,"[4] and such like. For it is impossible for man, who is a compound being, in which "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh,"[5] to

[1] Col. ii. 16. The whole passage in the English version is, "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or *in respect of an holyday*" (ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς). Origen's interpretation is not followed by any modern expositors. It is adopted by Chrysostom and Theodoret.

[2] Deut. xvi. 3.

[3] Ex. xii. 8.

[4] Lev. xvi. 29.

[5] Gal. v. 17.

keep the feast with his whole nature; for either he keeps the feast with his spirit and afflicts the body, which through the lust of the flesh is unfit to keep it along with the spirit, or else he keeps it with the body, and the spirit is unable to share in it. But we have for the present said enough on the subject of feasts.

Chapter xxiv.

Let us now see on what grounds Celsus urges us to make use of the idol offerings and the public sacrifices in the public feasts. His words are, "If these idols are nothing, what harm will there be in taking part in the feast? On the other hand, if they are demons, it is certain that they too are God's creatures, and that we must believe in them, sacrifice to them according to the laws, and pray to them that they may be propitious." In reference to this statement, it would be profitable for us to take up and clearly explain the whole passage of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, in which Paul treats of offerings to idols.[1] The apostle draws from the fact that "an idol is nothing in the world," the consequence that it is injurious to use things offered to idols; and he shows to those who have ears to hear on such subjects, that he who partakes of things offered to idols is worse than a murderer, for he destroys his own brethren, for whom Christ died. And further, he maintains that the sacrifices are made to demons; and from that he proceeds to show that those who join the table of demons become associated with the demons; and he concludes that a man cannot both be a partaker of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons. But since it would require a whole treatise to set forth fully all that is contained on this subject in the Epistle to the Corinthians, we shall content ourselves with this brief statement of the argument; for it will be evident to any one who carefully considers what has been said, that even if idols are nothing, nevertheless it is an awful thing to join in idol festivals. And even supposing that there are such beings as demons to whom the sacrifices are offered, it has been clearly shown that we are forbidden to take part in these festivals, when we know the difference between the table

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 4, 11.

of the Lord and the table of demons. And knowing this, we endeavour as much as we can to be always partakers of the Lord's table, and beware to the utmost of joining at any time the table of demons.

Chapter xxv.

Celsus says that "the demons belong to God, and are therefore to be believed, to be sacrificed to according to laws, and to be prayed to that they may be propitious." Those who are disposed to learn, must know that the word of God nowhere says of evil things that they belong to God, for it judges them unworthy of such a Lord. Accordingly, it is not all men who bear the name of "men of God," but only those who are worthy of God,—such as Moses and Elias, and any others who are so called, or such as resemble those who are so called in Scripture. In the same way, all angels are not said to be angels of God, but only those that are blessed: those that have fallen away into sin are called "angels of the devil," just as bad men are called "men of sin," "sons of perdition," or "sons of iniquity." Since, then, among men some are good and others bad, and the former are said to be God's and the latter the devil's, so among angels some are angels of God, and others angels of the devil. But among demons there is no such distinction, for all are said to be wicked. We do not therefore hesitate to say that Celsus is false when he says, "If they are demons, it is evident that they must also belong to God." He must either show that this distinction of good and bad among angels and men has no foundation, or else that a similar distinction may be shown to hold among demons. If that is impossible, it is plain that demons do not belong to God; for their prince is not God, but, as holy Scripture says, "Beelzebub."

Chapter xxvi.

And we are not to believe in demons, although Celsus urges us to do so; but if we are to obey God, we must die, or endure anything sooner than obey demons. In the same way, we are not to propitiate demons; for it is impossible to propitiate beings that are wicked and that seek the injury of men. Besides,

what are the laws in accordance with which Celsus would have us propitiate the demons? For if he means laws enacted in states, he must show that they are in agreement with the divine laws. But if that cannot be done, as the laws of many states are quite inconsistent with each other, these laws, therefore, must of necessity either be no laws at all in the proper sense of the word, or else the enactments of wicked men; and these we must not obey, for "we must obey God rather than men." Away, then, with this counsel, which Celsus gives us, to offer prayer to demons: it is not to be listened to for a moment; for our duty is to pray to the Most High God alone, and to the only-begotten, the first-born of the whole creation, and to ask Him as our High Priest to present the prayers which ascend to Him from us, to His God and our God, to His Father and the Father of those who direct their lives according to His word. And as we would have no desire to enjoy the favour of those men who wish us to follow their wicked lives, and who give us their favour only on condition that we choose nothing opposed to their wishes, because their favour would make us enemies of God, who cannot be pleased with those who have such men for their friends,—in the same way those who are acquainted with the nature, the purposes, and the wickedness of demons, can never wish to obtain their favour.

Chapter xxvii.

And Christians have nothing to fear, even if demons should not be well-disposed to them; for they are protected by the supreme God, who is well pleased with their piety, and who sets His divine angels to watch over those who are worthy of such guardianship, so that they can suffer nothing from demons. He who by his piety possesses the favour of the Most High, who has accepted the guidance of Jesus, the "Angel of the great counsel,"[1] being well contented with the favour of God through Christ Jesus, may say with confidence that he has nothing to suffer from the whole host of demons. "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear."[2]

[1] Isa. ix. 6 (LXX.). [2] Ps. xxvii. 1, 3.

So much, then, in reply to those statements of Celsus: "If they are demons, they too evidently belong to God, and they are to be believed, to be sacrificed to according to the laws, and prayers are to be offered to them that they may be propitious."

Chapter xxviii.

We shall now proceed to the next statement of Celsus, and examine it with care: "If in obedience to the traditions of their fathers they abstain from such victims, they must also abstain from all animal food, in accordance with the opinions of Pythagoras, who thus showed his respect for the soul and its bodily organs. But if, as they say, they abstain that they may not eat along with demons, I admire their wisdom, in having at length discovered, that whenever they eat they eat with demons, although they only refuse to do so when they are looking upon a slain victim; for when they eat bread, or drink wine, or taste fruits, do they not receive these things, as well as the water they drink and the air they breathe, from certain demons, to whom have been assigned these different provinces of nature?" Here I would observe that I cannot see how those whom he speaks of as abstaining from certain victims, in accordance with the traditions of their fathers, are consequently bound to abstain from the flesh of all animals. We do not indeed deny that the divine word does seem to command something similar to this, when to raise us to a higher and purer life it says, "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak;"[1] and again, "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died;"[2] and again, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."[3]

Chapter xxix.

But it is to be observed that the Jews, who claim for themselves a correct understanding of the law of Moses, carefully restrict their food to such things as are accounted clean, and abstain from those that are unclean. They also do not use in their food the blood of an animal nor the flesh of an animal

[1] Rom. xiv. 21. [2] Rom. xiv. 15. [3] 1 Cor. viii. 13.

torn by wild beasts, and some other things which it would take too long for us at present to detail. But Jesus, wishing to lead all men by His teaching to the pure worship and service of God, and anxious not to throw any hindrance in the way of many who might be benefited by Christianity, through the imposition of a burdensome code of rules in regard to food, has laid it down, that "not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth; for whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught. But those things which proceed out of the mouth are evil thoughts when spoken, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies."[1] Paul also says, "Meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse."[2] Wherefore, as there is some obscurity about this matter, without some explanation is given, it seemed good to the apostles of Jesus and the elders assembled together at Antioch, and also, as they themselves say, to the Holy Spirit, to write a letter to the Gentile believers, forbidding them to partake of those things from which alone they say it is necessary to abstain, namely, "things offered to idols, things strangled, and blood."[3]

Chapter xxx.

For that which is offered to idols is sacrificed to demons, and a man of God must not join the table of demons. As to things strangled, we are forbidden by Scripture to partake of them, because the blood is still in them; and blood, especially the odour arising from blood, is said to be the food of demons. Perhaps, then, if we were to eat of strangled animals, we might have such spirits feeding along with us. And the reason which forbids the use of strangled animals for food is also applicable to the use of blood. And it may not be amiss, as bearing on this point, to recall a beautiful saying in the writings of Sextus, which is known to most Christians: "The eating of animals," says he, "is a matter of indifference; but to abstain from them is more agreeable to reason." It is not, therefore, simply on account of some traditions of our fathers that we refrain

[1] Matt. xv. 11, 17–19. [2] 1 Cor. viii. 8.
[3] Acts xv. 28, 29. It was at Jerusalem.

from eating victims offered to those called gods or heroes or demons, but for other reasons, some of which I have here mentioned. It is not to be supposed, however, that we are to abstain from the flesh of animals in the same way as we are bound to abstain from all vice and wickedness: we are indeed to abstain not only from the flesh of animals, but from all other kinds of food, if we cannot partake of them without incurring evil, and the consequences of evil. For we are to avoid eating for gluttony, or for the mere gratification of the appetite, without regard to the health and sustenance of the body. We do not believe that souls pass from one body to another, and that they may descend so low as to enter the bodies of the brutes. If we abstain at times from eating the flesh of animals, it is evidently, therefore, not for the same reason as Pythagoras; for it is the reasonable soul alone that we honour, and we commit its bodily organs with due honours to the grave. For it is not right that the dwelling-place of the rational soul should be cast aside anywhere without honour, like the carcases of brute beasts; and so much the more when we believe that the respect paid to the body redounds to the honour of the person who received from God a soul which has nobly employed the organs of the body in which it resided. In regard to the question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" we have already answered it briefly, as our purpose required.

Chapter XXXI.

Celsus afterwards states what is adduced by Jews and Christians alike in defence of abstinence from idol sacrifices, namely, that it is wrong for those who have dedicated themselves to the Most High God to eat with demons. What he brings forward against this view, we have already seen. In our opinion, a man can only be said to eat and drink with demons when he eats the flesh of what are called sacred victims, and when he drinks the wine poured out to the honour of the demons. But Celsus thinks that we cannot eat bread or drink wine in any way whatever, or taste fruits, or even take a draught of water, without eating and drinking with demons. He adds also, that the air which we breathe is received from demons, and that not an

animal can breathe without receiving the air from the demons who are set over the air. If any one wishes to defend this statement of Celsus, let him show that it is not the divine angels of God, but demons, the whole race of whom are bad, that have been appointed to communicate all those blessings which have been mentioned. We indeed also maintain with regard not only to the fruits of the earth, but to every flowing stream and every breath of air, that the ground brings forth those things which are said to grow up naturally,—that the water springs in fountains, and refreshes the earth with running streams,—that the air is kept pure, and supports the life of those who breathe it only in consequence of the agency and control of certain beings whom we may call invisible husbandmen and guardians; but we deny that those invisible agents are demons. And if we might speak boldly, we would say that if demons have any share at all in these things, to them belong famine, blasting of the vine and fruit trees, pestilence among men and beasts: all these are the proper occupations of demons, who in the capacity of public executioners receive power at certain times to carry out the divine judgments, for the restoration of those who have plunged headlong into wickedness, or for the trial and discipline of the souls of the wise. For those who through all their afflictions preserve their piety pure and unimpaired, show their true character to all spectators, whether visible or invisible, who behold them; while those who are otherwise minded, yet conceal their wickedness, when they have their true character exposed by misfortunes, become manifest to themselves as well as to those whom we may also call spectators.

Chapter XXXII.

The Psalmist bears witness that divine justice employs certain evil angels to inflict calamities upon men: "He cast upon them the fierceness of His anger, wrath, and indignation, and trouble, sent by evil angels."[1] Whether demons ever go beyond this when they are suffered to do what they are ever ready, though through the restraint put upon them they are not always able to do, is a question to be solved by that man who can con-

[1] Ps. lxxviii. 49.

ceive, in so far as human nature will allow, how it accords with the divine justice, that such multitudes of human souls are separated from the body while walking in the paths which lead to certain death. "For the judgments of God are so great," that a soul which is still clothed with a mortal body cannot comprehend them; "and they cannot be expressed: therefore by unnurtured souls"[1] they are not in any measure to be understood. And hence, too, rash spirits, by their ignorance in these matters, and by recklessly setting themselves against the Divine Being, multiply impious objections against providence. It is not from demons, then, that men receive any of those things which meet the necessities of life, and least of all ourselves, who have been taught to make a proper use of these things. And they who partake of corn and wine, and the fruits of trees, of water and of air, do not feed with demons, but rather do they feast with divine angels, who are appointed for this purpose, and who are as it were invited to the table of the pious man, who hearkens to the precept of the word, which says, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God."[2] And again, in another place it is written, "Do all things in the name of God."[3] When, therefore, we eat and drink and breathe to the glory of God, and act in all things according to what is right, we feast with no demons, but with divine angels: "For every creature is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."[4] But it could not be good, and it could not be sanctified, if these things were, as Celsus supposes, entrusted to the charge of demons.

Chapter XXXIII.

From this it is evident that we have already met the next statement of Celsus, which is as follows: "We must either not live, and indeed not come into this life at all, or we must do so on condition that we give thanks and first-fruits and prayers to demons, who have been set over the things of this world: and that we must do as long as we live, that they may prove good and kind." We must surely live, and we must live according

[1] Wisdom of Sol. xvii. 1.
[2] Col. iii. 17.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 31.
[4] 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.

to the word of God, as far as we are enabled to do so. And we are thus enabled to live, when, "whether we eat or drink, we do all to the glory of God;" and we are not to refuse to enjoy those things which have been created for our use, but must receive them with thanksgiving to the Creator. And it is under these conditions, and not such as have been imagined by Celsus, that we have been brought into life by God; and we are not placed under demons, but we are under the government of the Most High God, through Him who hath brought us to God—Jesus Christ. It is not according to the law of God that any demon has had a share in worldly affairs, but it was by their own lawlessness that they perhaps sought out for themselves places destitute of the knowledge of God and of the divine life, or places where there are many enemies of God. Perhaps also, as being fit to rule over and punish them, they have been set by the Word, who governs all things, to rule over those who subjected themselves to evil and not to God. For this reason, then, let Celsus, as one who knows not God, give thank-offerings to demons. But we give thanks to the Creator of all, and, along with thanksgiving and prayer for the blessings we have received, we also eat the bread presented to us; and this bread becomes by prayer a sacred body, which sanctifies those who sincerely partake of it.

Chapter XXXIV.

Celsus would also have us to offer first-fruits to demons. But we would offer them to Him who said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth."[1] And to Him to whom we offer first-fruits we also send up our prayers, "having a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," and "we hold fast this profession"[2] as long as we live; for we find God and His only-begotten Son, manifested to us in Jesus, to be gracious and kind to us. And if we would wish to have besides a great number of beings who shall ever prove friendly to us, we are taught that "thousand thousands stood before Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand ministered unto Him."[3] And these, regarding

[1] Gen. i. 11. [2] Heb. iv. 14. [3] Dan. vii. 10.

all as their relations and friends who imitate their piety towards God, and in prayer call upon Him with sincerity, work along with them for their salvation, appear unto them, deem it their office and duty to attend to them, and as if by common agreement they visit with all manner of kindness and deliverance those who pray to God, to whom they themselves also pray: "For they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation."[1] Let the learned Greeks say that the human soul at its birth is placed under the charge of demons: Jesus has taught us not to despise even the little ones in His church, saying, "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."[2] And the prophet says, "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them."[3] We do not, then, deny that there are many demons upon earth, but we maintain that they exist and exercise power among the wicked, as a punishment of their wickedness. But they have no power over those who "have put on the whole armour of God," who have received strength to "withstand the wiles of the devil,"[4] and who are ever engaged in contests with them, knowing that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."[5]

Chapter xxxv.

Now let us consider another saying of Celsus, which is as follows: "The satrap of a Persian or Roman monarch, or ruler or general or governor, yea, even those who fill lower offices of trust or service in the state, would be able to do great injury to those who despised them; and will the satraps and ministers of earth and air be insulted with impunity?" Observe now how he introduces servants of the Most High—rulers, generals, governors, and those filling lower offices of trust and service—as, after the manner of men, inflicting injury upon those who insult them. For he does not consider that a wise man would not wish to do harm to any, but would strive to the utmost of his power to change and amend them; unless, indeed,

[1] Heb. i. 14. [2] Matt. xviii. 10. [3] Ps. xxxiv. 7.
[4] Eph. vi. 11. [5] Eph. vi. 12.

it be that those whom Celsus makes servants and rulers appointed by the Most High are behind Lycurgus, the lawgiver of the Lacedæmonians, or Zeno of Citium. For when Lycurgus had had his eye put out by a man, he got the offender into his power; but instead of taking revenge upon him, he ceased not to use all his arts of persuasion until he induced him to become a philosopher. And Zeno, on the occasion of some one saying, "Let me perish rather than not have my revenge on thee," answered him, "But rather let me perish if I do not make a friend of thee." And I am not yet speaking of those whose characters have been formed by the teaching of Jesus, and who have heard the words, "Love your enemies, and pray for them which despitefully use you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."[1] And in the prophetical writings the righteous man says, "O Lord my God, if I have done this; if there be iniquity in my hands; if I have returned evil to those who have done evil to me, let me fall helpless under mine enemies: let my enemy persecute my soul, and take it; yea, let him tread down my life upon the earth."[2]

Chapter xxxvi.

But the angels, who are the true rulers and generals and ministers of God, do not, as Celsus supposes, "injure those who offend them;" and if certain demons, whom Celsus had in mind, do inflict evils, they show that they are wicked, and that they have received no office of the kind from God. And they even do injury to those who are under them, and who have acknowledged them as their masters; and accordingly, as it would seem that those who break through the regulations which prevail in any country in regard to matters of food, suffer for it if they are under the demons of that place, while those who are not under them, and have not submitted to their power, are free from all harm, and bid defiance to such spirits; although if, in ignorance of certain things, they have come under the power of other demons, they may suffer punishment from them. But the Christian—the true Christian, I mean—

[1] Matt. v. 44, 45. [2] Ps. vii. 3–6.

who has submitted to God alone and His Word, will suffer nothing from demons, for He is mightier than demons. And the Christian will suffer nothing, for "the angel of the Lord will encamp about them that fear Him, and will deliver them,"[1] and his "angel," who "always beholds the face of his Father in heaven,"[2] offers up his prayers through the one High Priest to the God of all, and also joins his own prayers with those of the man who is committed to his keeping. Let not, then, Celsus try to scare us with threats of mischief from demons, for we despise them. And the demons, when despised, can do no harm to those who are under the protection of Him who can alone help all who deserve His aid; and He does no less than set His own angels over His devout servants, so that none of the hostile angels, nor even he who is called "the prince of this world,"[3] can effect anything against those who have given themselves to God.

Chapter XXXVII.

In the next place, Celsus forgets that he is addressing Christians, who pray to God alone through Jesus; and mixing up other notions with theirs, he absurdly attributes them all to Christians. "If," says he, "they who are addressed are called upon by barbarous names, they will have power, but no longer will they have any if they are addressed in Greek or Latin." Let him, then, state plainly whom we call upon for help by barbarous names. Any one will be convinced that this is a false charge which Celsus brings against us, when he considers that Christians in prayer do not even use the precise names which divine Scripture applies to God; but the Greeks use Greek names, the Romans Latin names, and every one prays and sings praises to God as he best can, in his mother tongue. For the Lord of all the languages of the earth hears those who pray to Him in each different tongue, hearing, if I may so say, but one voice, expressing itself in various dialects. For the Most High is not as one of those who select one language, barbarian or Greek, knowing nothing of any other, and caring nothing for those who speak in other tongues.

[1] Ps. xxxiv. 7. [2] Matt. xviii. 10. [3] John xiv. 30.

Chapter XXXVIII.

He next represents Christians as saying what he never heard from any Christian; or if he did, it must have been from one of the most ignorant and lawless of the people. "Behold," they are made to say, "I go up to a statue of Jupiter or Apollo, or some other god: I revile it, and beat it, yet it takes no vengeance on me." He is not aware that among the prohibitions of the divine law is this, "Thou shalt not revile the gods,"[1] and this is intended to prevent the formation of the habit of reviling any one whatever; for we have been taught, "Bless, and curse not,"[2] and it is said that "revilers shall not inherit the kingdom of God."[3] And who amongst us is so foolish as to speak in the way Celsus describes, and to fail to see that such contemptuous language can be of no avail for removing prevailing notions about the gods? For it is matter of observation that there are men who utterly deny the existence of a God or of an overruling providence, and who by their impious and destructive teaching have founded sects among those who are called philosophers, and yet neither they themselves, nor those who have embraced their opinions, have suffered any of those things which mankind generally account evils: they are both strong in body and rich in possessions. And yet if we ask what loss they have sustained, we shall find that they have suffered the most certain injury. For what greater injury can befall a man than that he should be unable amidst the order of the world to see Him who has made it? and what sorer affliction can come to any one than that blindness of mind which prevents him from seeing the Creator and Father of every soul?

Chapter XXXIX.

After putting such words into our mouth, and maliciously charging Christians with sentiments which they never held, he then proceeds to give to this supposed expression of Christian feeling an answer, which is indeed more a mockery than an answer, when he says, "Do you not see, good sir, that even your own demon is not only reviled, but banished from every

[1] Ex. xxii. 28. [2] Rom. xii. 14. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 10.

land and sea, and you yourself, who are as it were an image dedicated to him, are bound and led to punishment, and fastened to the stake, whilst your demon—or, as you call him, 'the Son of God'—takes no vengeance on the evil-doer?" This answer would be admissible if we employed such language as he ascribes to us; although even then he would have no right to call the Son of God a demon. For as we hold that all demons are evil, He who turns so many men to God is in our view no demon, but God the Word, and the Son of God. And I know not how Celsus has so far forgotten himself as to call Jesus Christ a demon, when he nowhere alludes to the existence of any evil demons. And finally, as to the punishments threatened against the ungodly, these will come upon them after they have refused all remedies, and have been, as we may say, visited with an incurable malady of sinfulness.

Chapter xl.

Such is our doctrine of punishment; and the inculcation of this doctrine turns many from their sins. But let us see, on the other hand, what is the response given on this subject by the priest of Jupiter or Apollo of whom Celsus speaks. It is this: "The mills of God grind slowly."[1] Another describes punishment as reaching "to children's children, and to those who came after them."[2] How much better are those words of Scripture: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers. Every man shall be put to death for his own sin."[3] And again, "Every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge."[4] And, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."[5] If any shall say that the response, "To children's children, and to those who come after them," corresponds with that passage, "Who visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate

[1] "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind to powder" (Plutarch).

[2] Hom. *Il.* xx. 308.

[3] Deut. xxiv. 16.

[4] Jer. xxxi. 30.

[5] Ezek. xviii. 20.

me,"[1] let him learn from Ezekiel that this language is not to be taken literally; for he reproves those who say, "Our fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,"[2] and then he adds, "As I live, saith the Lord, every one shall die for his own sin." As to the proper meaning of the figurative language about sins being visited unto the third and fourth generation, we cannot at present stay to explain.

Chapter XLI.

He then goes on to rail against us after the manner of old wives. "You," says he, "mock and revile the statues of our gods; but if you had reviled Bacchus or Hercules in person, you would not perhaps have done so with impunity. But those who crucified your God when present among men, suffered nothing for it, either at the time or during the whole of their lives. And what new thing has there happened since then to make us believe that he was not an impostor, but the Son of God? And forsooth, he who sent his Son with certain instructions for mankind, allowed him to be thus cruelly treated, and his instructions to perish with him, without ever during all this long time showing the slightest concern. What father was ever so inhuman? Perhaps, indeed, you may say that he suffered so much, because it was his wish to bear what came to him. But it is open to those whom you maliciously revile, to adopt the same language, and say that they wish to be reviled, and therefore they bear it with patience; for it is best to deal equally with both sides,—although these [gods] severely punish the scorner, so that he must either flee and hide himself, or be taken and perish." Now to these statements I would answer that we revile no one, for we believe that "revilers will not inherit the kingdom of God."[3] And we read, "Bless them that curse you; bless, and curse not;" also, "Being reviled, we bless." And even although the abuse which we pour upon another may seem to have some excuse in the wrong which we have received from him, yet such abuse is not allowed by the word of God. And how much more ought we to abstain from reviling others, when we consider what a great folly it is! And it is equally foolish to apply abusive language to stone or gold or silver, turned into

[1] Ex. xx. 5. [2] Ezek. xviii. 2–4. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 10.

what is supposed to be the form of God by those who have no knowledge of God. Accordingly, we throw ridicule not upon lifeless images, but upon those only who worship them. Moreover, if certain demons reside in certain images, and one of them passes for Bacchus, another for Hercules, we do not vilify them: for, on the one hand, it would be useless; and, on the other, it does not become one who is meek, and peaceful, and gentle in spirit, and who has learnt that no one among men or demons is to be reviled, however wicked he may be.

Chapter xlii.

There is an inconsistency into which, strangely enough, Celsus has fallen unawares. Those demons or gods whom he extolled a little before, he now shows to be in fact the vilest of creatures, punishing more for their own revenge than for the improvement of those who revile them. His words are, "If you had reviled Bacchus or Hercules when present in person, you would not have escaped with impunity." How any one can hear without being present in person, I leave any one who will to explain; as also those other questions, "Why he is sometimes present, and sometimes absent?" and, "What is the business which takes demons away from place to place?" Again, when he says, "Those who crucified your God himself, suffered no harm for doing so," he supposes that it is the body of Jesus extended on the cross and slain, and not His divine nature, that we call God; and that it was as God that Jesus was crucified and slain. As we have already dwelt at length on the sufferings which Jesus suffered as a man, we shall purposely say no more here, that we may not repeat what we have said already. But when he goes on to say that "those who inflicted death upon Jesus suffered nothing afterwards through so long a time," we must inform him, as well as all who are disposed to learn the truth, that the city in which the Jewish people called for the crucifixion of Jesus with shouts of "Crucify him, crucify him,"[1] preferring to have the robber set free, who had been cast into prison for sedition and murder, and Jesus, who had been delivered through envy, to be crucified, —that this city not long afterwards was attacked, and, after a long siege, was utterly overthrown and laid waste; for God

[1] Luke xxiii. 21, 25.

judged the inhabitants of that place unworthy of living together the life of citizens. And yet, though it may seem an incredible thing to say, God spared this people in delivering them to their enemies; for He saw that they were incurably averse to any amendment, and were daily sinking deeper and deeper into evil. And all this befell them, because the blood of Jesus was shed at their instigation and on their land; and the land was no longer able to bear those who were guilty of so fearful a crime against Jesus.

Chapter xliii.

Some new thing, then, has come to pass since the time that Jesus suffered,—that, I mean, which has happened to the city, to the whole nation, and in the sudden and general rise of a Christian community. And that, too, is a new thing, that those who were strangers to the covenants of God, with no part in His promises, and far from the truth, have by a divine power been enabled to embrace the truth. These things were not the work of an impostor, but were the work of God, who sent His Word, Jesus Christ, to make known His purposes.[1] The sufferings and death which Jesus endured with such fortitude and meekness, show the cruelty and injustice of those who inflicted them, but they did not destroy the announcement of the purposes of God; indeed, if we may so say, they served rather to make them known. For Jesus Himself taught us this when He said, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth by itself alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."[2] Jesus, then, who is this grain of wheat, died, and brought forth much fruit. And the Father is ever looking forward for the results of the death of the grain of wheat, both those which are arising now, and those which shall arise hereafter. The Father of Jesus is therefore a tender and loving Father, though "He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up" as His lamb "for us all,"[3] that so "the Lamb of God," by dying for all men, might "take away the sin of the world." It was not by compulsion, therefore, but willingly, that

[1] ἀγγελμάτων. Spencer reads ἀγαλμάτων in this and the following sentences.

[2] John xii. 24.

[3] Rom. viii. 32.

He bore the reproaches of those who reviled Him. Then Celsus, returning to those who apply abusive language to images, says: "Of those whom you load with insults, you may in like manner say that they voluntarily submit to such treatment, and therefore they bear insults with patience; for it is best to deal equally with both sides. Yet these severely punish the scorner, so that he must either flee and hide himself, or be taken and perish." It is not, then, because Christians cast insults upon demons that they incur their revenge, but because they drive them away out of the images, and from the bodies and souls of men. And here, although Celsus perceives it not, he has on this subject spoken something like the truth; for it is true that the souls of those who condemn Christians, and betray them, and rejoice in persecuting them, are filled with wicked demons.

Chapter XLIV.

But when the souls of those who die for the Christian faith depart from the body with great glory, they destroy the power of the demons, and frustrate their designs against men. Wherefore I imagine, that as the demons have learnt from experience that they are defeated and overpowered by the martyrs for the truth, they are afraid to have recourse again to violence. And thus, until they forget the defeats they have sustained, it is probable that the world will be at peace with the Christians. But when they recover their power, and, with eyes blinded by sin, wish again to take their revenge on Christians, and persecute them, then again they will be defeated, and then again the souls of the godly, who lay down their lives for the cause of godliness, shall utterly destroy the army of the wicked one. And as the demons perceive that those who meet death victoriously for the sake of religion destroy their authority, while those who give way under their sufferings, and deny the faith, come under their power, I imagine that at times they feel a deep interest in Christians when on their trial, and keenly strive to gain them over to their side, feeling as they do that their confession is torture to them, and their denial is a relief and encouragement to them. And traces of the same feeling may be seen in the demeanour of the judges; for they are greatly distressed at seeing those who bear outrage and torture with patience, but

are greatly elated when a Christian gives way under it. Yet it is from no feeling of humanity that this arises. They see well, that, while "the tongues" of those who are overpowered by the tortures "may take the oath, the mind has not sworn."[1] And this may serve as an answer to the remark of Celsus: "But they severely punish one who reviles them, so that he must either flee and hide himself, or be taken and perish." If a Christian ever flees away, it is not from fear, but in obedience to the command of his Master, that so he may preserve himself, and employ his strength for the benefit of others.

Chapter XLV.

Let us see what Celsus next goes on to say. It is as follows: "What need is there to collect all the oracular responses, which have been delivered with a divine voice by priests and priestesses, as well as by others, whether men or women, who were under a divine influence?—all the wonderful things that have been heard issuing from the inner sanctuary?—all the revelations that have been made to those who consulted the sacrificial victims?—and all the knowledge that has been conveyed to men by other signs and prodigies? To some the gods have appeared in visible forms. The world is full of such instances. How many cities have been built in obedience to commands received from oracles; how often, in the same way, delivered from disease and famine! Or again, how many cities, from disregard or forgetfulness of these oracles, have perished miserably! How many colonies have been established and made to flourish by following their orders! How many princes and private persons have, from this cause, had prosperity or adversity! How many who mourned over their childlessness, have obtained the blessing they asked for! How many have turned away from themselves the anger of demons! How many who were maimed in their limbs, have had them restored! And again, how many have met with summary punishment for showing want of reverence to the temples—some being instantly seized with madness, others openly confessing their crimes, others having put an end to their lives, and others having become the victims of incurable maladies! Yea, some have

[1] Euripides, Hippolytus.

been slain by a terrible voice issuing from the inner sanctuary." I know not how it comes that Celsus brings forward these as undoubted facts, whilst at the same time he treats as mere fables the wonders which are recorded and handed down to us as having happened among the Jews, or as having been performed by Jesus and His disciples. For why may not our accounts be true, and those of Celsus fables and fictions? At least, these latter were not believed by the followers of Democritus, Epicurus, and Aristotle, although perhaps these Grecian sects would have been convinced by the evidence in support of our miracles, if Moses or any of the prophets who wrought these wonders, or Jesus Christ Himself, had come in their way.

Chapter xlvi.

It is related of the priestess of Apollo, that she at times allowed herself to be influenced in her answers by bribes; but our prophets were admired for their plain truthfulness, not only by their contemporaries, but also by those who lived in later times. For through the commands pronounced by the prophets cities were founded, men were cured, and plagues were stayed. Indeed, the whole Jewish race went out as a colony from Egypt to Palestine, in accordance with the divine oracles. They also, when they followed the commands of God, were prosperous; when they departed from them, they suffered reverses. What need is there to quote all the princes and private persons in Scripture history who fared well or ill according as they obeyed or despised the words of the prophets? If we refer to those who were unhappy because they were childless, but who, after offering prayers to the Creator of all, became fathers and mothers, let any one read the accounts of Abraham and Sarah, to whom at an advanced age was born Isaac, the father of the whole Jewish nation: and there are other instances of the same thing. Let him also read the account of Hezekiah, who not only recovered from his sickness, according to the prediction of Isaiah, but was also bold enough to say, "Afterwards I shall beget children, who shall declare Thy righteousness."[1] And in the fourth book of Kings we read that the prophet Elisha made known to a woman who had received him hospitably, that by

[1] Isa. xxxviii. 19 (according to the LXX.).

the grace of God she should have a son; and through the prayers of Elisha she became a mother. The maimed were cured by Jesus in great numbers. And the books of the Maccabees relate what punishments were inflicted upon those who dared to profane the Jewish service in the temple at Jerusalem.

Chapter XLVII.

But the Greeks will say that these accounts are fabulous, although two whole nations are witnesses to their truth. But why may we not consider the accounts of the Greeks as fabulous rather than those? Perhaps some one, however, wishing not to appear blindly to accept his own statements and reject those of others, would conclude, after a close examination of the matter, that the wonders mentioned by the Greeks were performed by certain demons; those among the Jews by prophets or by angels, or by God through the means of angels, and those recorded by Christians by Jesus Himself, or by His power working in His apostles. Let us, then, compare all these accounts together; let us examine into the aim and purpose of those who performed them; and let us inquire what effect was produced upon the persons on whose account these acts of kindness were performed, whether beneficial or hurtful, or neither the one nor the other. The ancient Jewish people, before they sinned against God, and were for their great wickedness cast off by Him, must evidently have been a people of great wisdom.[1] But Christians, who have in so wonderful a manner formed themselves into a community, appear at first to have been more induced by miracles than by exhortations to forsake the institutions of their fathers, and to adopt others which were quite strange to them. And indeed, if we were to reason from what is probable as to the first formation of the Christian society, we should say that it is incredible that the apostles of Jesus Christ, who were unlettered men of humble life, could have been emboldened to preach Christian truth to men by anything else than the power which was conferred upon them, and the grace which accompanied their words and rendered them effective; and those who heard them would not

[1] φιλόσοφον.

have renounced the old-established usages of their fathers, and been induced to adopt notions so different from those in which they had been brought up, unless they had been moved by some extraordinary power, and by the force of miraculous events.

Chapter XLVIII.

In the next place, Celsus, after referring to the enthusiasm with which men will contend unto death rather than abjure Christianity, adds strangely enough some remarks, in which he wishes to show that our doctrines are similar to those delivered by the priests at the celebration of the heathen mysteries. He says, "Just as you, good sir, believe in eternal punishments, so also do the priests who interpret and initiate into the sacred mysteries. The same punishments with which you threaten others, they threaten you. Now it is worthy of examination, which of the two is more firmly established as true; for both parties contend with equal assurance that the truth is on their side. But if we require proofs, the priests of the heathen gods produce many that are clear and convincing, partly from wonders performed by demons, and partly from the answers given by oracles, and various other modes of divination." He would, then, have us believe that we and the interpreters of the mysteries equally teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, and that it is a matter for inquiry on which side of the two the truth lies. Now I should say that the truth lies with those who are able to induce their hearers to live as men who are convinced of the truth of what they have heard. But Jews and Christians have been thus affected by the doctrines they hold about what we speak of as the world to come, and the rewards of the righteous, and the punishments of the wicked. Let Celsus then, or any one who will, show us who have been moved in this way in regard to eternal punishments by the teaching of heathen priests and mystagogues. For surely the purpose of him who brought to light this doctrine was not only to reason upon the subject of punishments, and to strike men with terror of them, but to induce those who heard the truth to strive with all their might against those sins which are the causes of punishment. And those who study the prophecies with care, and are not content with a cursory perusal of the

predictions contained in them, will find them such as to convince the intelligent and sincere reader that the Spirit of God was in those men, and that with their writings there is nothing in all the works of demons, responses of oracles, or sayings of soothsayers, for one moment to be compared.

Chapter xlix.

Let us see in what terms Celsus next addresses us: "Besides, is it not most absurd and inconsistent in you, on the one hand, to make so much of the body as you do—to expect that the same body will rise again, as though it were the best and most precious part of us; and yet, on the other, to expose it to such tortures as though it were worthless? But men who hold such notions, and are so attached to the body, are not worthy of being reasoned with; for in this and in other respects they show themselves to be gross, impure, and bent upon revolting without any reason from the common belief. But I shall direct my discourse to those who hope for the enjoyment of eternal life with God by means of the soul or mind, whether they choose to call it a spiritual substance, an intelligent spirit, holy and blessed, or a living soul, or the heavenly and indestructible offspring of a divine and incorporeal nature, or by whatever name they designate the spiritual nature of man. And they are rightly persuaded that those who live well shall be blessed, and the unrighteous shall all suffer everlasting punishments. And from this doctrine neither they nor any other should ever swerve." Now, as he has often already reproached us for our opinions on the resurrection, and as we have on these occasions defended our opinions in what seemed to us a reasonable way, we do not intend, at each repetition of the one objection, to go into a repetition of our defence. Celsus makes an unfounded charge against us when he ascribes to us the opinion that "there is nothing in our complex nature better or more precious than the body;" for we hold that far beyond all bodies is the soul, and especially the reasonable soul; for it is the soul, and not the body, which bears the likeness of the Creator. For, according to us, God is not corporeal, unless we fall into the absurd errors of the followers of Zeno and Chrysippus.

Chapter L.

But since he reproaches us with too great an anxiety about the body, let him know that when that feeling is a wrong one we do not share in it, and when it is indifferent we only long for that which God has promised to the righteous. But Celsus considers that we are inconsistent with ourselves when we count the body worthy of honour from God, and therefore hope for its resurrection, and yet at the same time expose it to tortures as though it were not worthy of honour. But surely it is not without honour for the body to suffer for the sake of godliness, and to choose afflictions on account of virtue: the dishonourable thing would be for it to waste its powers in vicious indulgence. For the divine word says: "What is an honourable seed? The seed of man. What is a dishonourable seed? The seed of man."[1] Moreover, Celsus thinks that he ought not to reason with those who hope for the good of the body, as they are unreasonably intent upon an object which can never satisfy their expectations. He also calls them gross and impure men, bent upon creating needless dissensions. But surely he ought, as one of superior humanity, to assist even the rude and depraved. For society does not exclude from its pale the coarse and uncultivated, as it does the irrational animals, but our Creator made us on the same common level with all mankind. It is not an undignified thing, therefore, to reason even with the coarse and unrefined, and to try to bring them as far as possible to a higher state of refinement—to bring the impure to the highest practicable degree of purity—to bring the unreasoning multitude to reason, and the diseased in mind to spiritual health.

Chapter LI.

In the next place, he expresses his approval of those who "hope that eternal life shall be enjoyed with God by the soul or mind, or, as it is variously called, the spiritual nature, the reasonable soul, intelligent, holy, and blessed;" and he allows the soundness of the doctrine, that "those who had a good life shall be happy, and the unrighteous shall suffer eternal punish-

[1] Ecclus. x. 19. In the LXX. the last clause is, "What is a dishonourable seed? They that transgress the commandments."

ments." And yet I wonder at what follows, more than at anything that Celsus has ever said; for he adds, "And from this doctrine let not them or any one ever swerve." For certainly in writing against Christians, the very essence of whose faith is God, and the promises made by Christ to the righteous, and His warnings of punishment awaiting the wicked, he must see that, if a Christian were brought to renounce Christianity by his arguments against it, it is beyond doubt that, along with his Christian faith, he would cast off the very doctrine from which he says that no Christian and no man should ever swerve. But I think Celsus has been far surpassed in consideration for his fellow-men by Chrysippus in his treatise, *On the Subjugation of the Passions.* For when he sought to apply remedies to the affections and passions which oppress and distract the human spirit, after employing such arguments as seemed to himself to be strong, he did not shrink from using in the second and third place others which he did not himself approve of. "For," says he, "if it were held by any one that there are three kinds of good, we must seek to regulate the passions in accordance with that supposition; and we must not too curiously inquire into the opinions held by a person at the time that he is under the influence of passion, lest, if we delay too long for the purpose of overthrowing the opinions by which the mind is possessed, the opportunity for curing the passion may pass away." And he adds, "Thus, supposing that pleasure were the highest good, or that he was of that opinion whose mind was under the dominion of passion, we should not the less give him help, and show that, even on the principle that pleasure is the highest and final good of man, all passion is disallowed." And Celsus, in like manner, after having embraced the doctrine, "that the righteous shall be blessed, and the wicked shall suffer eternal punishments," should have followed out his subject; and, after having advanced what seemed to him the chief argument, he should have proceeded to prove and enforce by further reasons the truth that the unjust shall surely suffer eternal punishment, and those who lead a good life shall be blessed.

Chapter lii.

For we who have been persuaded by many, yea by innume-

rable, arguments to lead a Christian life, are especially anxious to bring all men as far as possible to receive the whole system of Christian truth; but when we meet with persons who are prejudiced by the calumnies thrown out against Christians, and who, from a notion that Christians are an impious people, will not listen to any who offer to instruct them in the principles of the divine word, then, on the common principles of humanity, we endeavour to the best of our ability to convince them of the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked, and to induce even those who are unwilling to become Christians to accept that truth. And we are thus anxious to persuade them of the rewards of right living, when we see that many things which we teach about a healthy moral life are also taught by the enemies of our faith. For you will find that they have not entirely lost the common notions of right and wrong, of good and evil. Let all men, therefore, when they look upon the universe, observe the constant revolution of the unerring stars, the converse motion of the planets, the constitution of the atmosphere, and its adaptation to the necessities of the animals, and especially of man, with all the innumerable contrivances for the wellbeing of mankind; and then, after thus considering the order of the universe, let them beware of doing aught which is displeasing to the Creator of this universe, of the soul and its intelligent principle; and let them rest assured that punishment shall be inflicted on the wicked, and rewards shall be bestowed upon the righteous, by Him who deals with every one as he deserves, and who will proportion His rewards to the good that each has done, and to the account of himself that he is able to give. And let all men know that the good shall be advanced to a higher state, and that the wicked shall be delivered over to sufferings and torments, in punishment of their licentiousness and depravity, their cowardice, timidity, and all their follies.

Chapter liii.

Having said so much on this subject, let us proceed to another statement of Celsus: "Since men are born united to a body, whether to suit the order of the universe, or that they may in that way suffer the punishment of sin; or because the

soul is oppressed by certain passions until it is purged from these at the appointed period of time,—for, according to Empedocles, all mankind must be banished from the abodes of the blessed for 30,000 periods of time,—we must therefore believe that they are entrusted to certain beings as keepers of this prison-house." You will observe that Celsus, in these remarks, speaks of such weighty matters in the language of doubtful human conjecture. He adds also various opinions as to the origin of man, and shows considerable reluctance to set down any of these opinions as false. When he had once come to the conclusion neither indiscriminately to accept nor recklessly to reject the opinions held by the ancients, would it not have been in accordance with that same rule of judging, if, when he found himself not disposed to believe the doctrines taught by the Jewish prophets and by Jesus, at any rate to have held them as matters open to inquiry? And should he not have considered whether it is very probable that a people who faithfully served the Most High God, and who ofttimes encountered numberless dangers, and even death, rather than sacrifice the honour of God, and what they believed to be the revelations of His will, should have been wholly overlooked by God? Should it not rather be thought probable that people who despised the efforts of human art to represent the Divine Being, but strove rather to rise in thought to the knowledge of the Most High, should have been favoured with some revelation from Himself? Besides, he ought to have considered that the common Father and Creator of all, who sees and hears all things, and who duly esteems the intention of every man who seeks Him and desires to serve Him, will grant unto these also some of the benefits of His rule, and will give them an enlargement of that knowledge of Himself which He has once bestowed upon them. If this had been remembered by Celsus and the others who hate Moses and the Jewish prophets, and Jesus, and His faithful disciples, who endured so much for the sake of His word, they would not thus have reviled Moses, and the prophets, and Jesus, and His apostles; and they would not have singled out for their contempt the Jews beyond all the nations of the earth, and said they were worse even than the Egyptians,—a people who, either from superstition or some other form of delusion, went as far

as they could in degrading the Divine Being to the level of brute beasts. And we invite inquiry, not as though we wished to lead any to doubt regarding the truths of Christianity, but in order to show that it would be better for those who in every way revile the doctrines of Christianity, at any rate to suspend their judgment, and not so rashly to state about Jesus and His apostles such things as they do not know, and as they cannot prove, either by what the Stoics call "apprehensive perception,"[1] or by any other methods used by different sects of philosophers as criteria of truth.

Chapter LIV.

When Celsus adds, "We must therefore believe that men are entrusted to certain beings who are the keepers of this prison-house," our answer is, that the souls of those who are called by Jeremiah "prisoners of the earth,"[2] when eager in the pursuit of virtue, are even in this life delivered from the bondage of evil; for Jesus declared this, as was foretold long before His advent by the prophet Isaiah, when he said that "the prisoners would go forth, and they that were in darkness would show themselves."[3] And Jesus Himself, as Isaiah also foretold of Him, arose as "a light to them that sat in darkness and in the shadow of death,"[4] so that we may therefore say, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast their cords from us."[5] If Celsus, and those who like him are opposed to us, had been able to sound the depths of the gospel narratives, they would not have counselled us to put our confidence in those beings whom they call "the keepers of the prison-house." It is written in the Gospel that a woman was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus beheld her, and perceived from what cause she was bowed together, he said, "Ought not this daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?"[6] And how many others are still bowed down and bound by Satan, who hinders them from looking up at all, and who would have us to look down also! And no one can raise them up, except the Word, that came by Jesus Christ,

[1] καταληπτικὴ φαντασία. [2] Lam. iii. 34. [3] Isa. xlix. 9.
[4] Isa. ix. 2. [5] Ps. ii. 3. [6] Luke xiii. 11, 16.

and that aforetime inspired the prophets. And Jesus came to release those who were under the dominion of the devil; and, speaking of him, He said with that depth of meaning which characterized His words, "Now is the prince of this world judged." We are, then, indulging in no baseless calumnies against demons, but are condemning their agency upon earth as destructive to mankind, and show that, under cover of oracles and bodily cures, and such other means, they are seeking to separate from God the soul which has descended to this "body of humiliation;" and those who feel this humiliation exclaim, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"[1] It is not in vain, therefore, that we expose our bodies to be beaten and tortured; for surely it is not in vain for a man to submit to such sufferings, if by that means he may avoid bestowing the name of gods on those earthly spirits that unite with their worshippers to bring him to destruction. Indeed, we think it both reasonable in itself and well-pleasing to God, to suffer pain for the sake of virtue, to undergo torture for the sake of piety, and even to suffer death for the sake of holiness; for "precious in the sight of God is the death of His saints;"[2] and we maintain that to overcome the love of life is to enjoy a great good. But when Celsus compares us to notorious criminals, who justly suffer punishment for their crimes, and does not shrink from placing so laudable a purpose as that which we set before us upon the same level with the obstinacy of criminals, he makes himself the brother and companion of those who accounted Jesus among criminals, fulfilling the Scripture, which saith, "He was numbered with transgressors."[3]

Chapter LV.

Celsus goes on to say: "They must make their choice between two alternatives. If they refuse to render due service to the gods, and to respect those who are set over this service, let them not come to manhood, or marry wives, or have children, or indeed take any share in the affairs of life; but let them depart hence with all speed, and leave no posterity behind them, that such a race may become extinct from the face of the earth.

[1] Rom. vii. 24. [2] Ps. cxvi. 15. [3] Isa. liii. 12.

Or, on the other hand, if they will take wives, and bring up children, and taste of the fruits of the earth, and partake of all the blessings of life, and bear its appointed sorrows (for nature herself hath allotted sorrows to all men; for sorrows must exist, and earth is the only place for them), then must they discharge the duties of life until they are released from its bonds, and render due honour to those beings who control the affairs of this life, if they would not show themselves ungrateful to them. For it would be unjust in them, after receiving the good things which they dispense, to pay them no tribute in return." To this we reply, that there appears to us to be no good reason for our leaving this world, except when piety and virtue require it; as when, for example, those who are set as judges, and think that they have power over our lives, place before us the alternative either to live in violation of the commands of Jesus, or to die if we continue obedient to them. But God has allowed us to marry, because all are not fit for the higher, that is, the perfectly pure life; and God would have us to bring up all our children, and not to destroy any of the offspring given us by His providence. And this does not conflict with our purpose not to obey the demons that are on the earth; for, "being armed with the whole armour of God, we stand"[1] as athletes of piety against the race of demons that plot against us.

Chapter LVI.

Although, therefore, Celsus would, in his own words, "drive us with all haste out of life," so that "such a race may become extinct from the earth;" yet we, along with those who worship the Creator, will live according to the laws of God, never consenting to obey the laws of sin. We will marry if we wish, and bring up the children given to us in marriage; and if need be, we will not only partake of the blessings of life, but bear its appointed sorrows as a trial to our souls. For in this way is divine Scripture accustomed to speak of human afflictions, by which, as gold is tried in the fire, so the spirit of man is tried, and is found to be worthy either of condemnation or of praise. For those things which Celsus calls evils we are therefore prepared, and are ready to say, "Try me, O Lord, and prove

[1] Eph. vi. 11.

me; purge my reins and my heart."[1] For "no one will be crowned," unless here upon earth, with this body of humiliation, "he strive lawfully."[2] Further, we do not pay honours supposed to be due to those whom Celsus speaks of as being set over the affairs of the world. For we worship the Lord our God, and Him only do we serve, and desire to be followers of Christ, who, when the devil said to Him, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me," answered him by the words, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."[3] Wherefore we do not render the honour supposed to be due to those who, according to Celsus, are set over the affairs of this world; for "no man can serve two masters," and we "cannot serve God and mammon," whether this name be applied to one or more. Moreover, if any one "by transgressing the law dishonours the lawgiver," it seems clear to us that if the two laws, the law of God and the law of mammon, are completely opposed to each other, it is better for us by transgressing the law of mammon to dishonour mammon, that we may honour God by keeping His law, than by transgressing the law of God to dishonour God, that by obeying the law of mammon we may honour mammon.

Chapter lvii.

Celsus supposes that men "discharge the duties of life until they are loosened from its bonds," when, in accordance with commonly received customs, they offer sacrifices to each of the gods recognised in the state; and he fails to perceive the true duty which is fulfilled by an earnest piety. For we say that he truly discharges the duties of life who is ever mindful who is his Creator, and what things are agreeable to Him, and who acts in all things so that he may please God. Again, Celsus wishes us to be thankful to these demons, imagining that we owe them thankofferings. But we, while recognising the duty of thankfulness, maintain that we show no ingratitude by refusing to give thanks to beings who do us no good, but who rather set themselves against us when we neither sacrifice to them nor worship them. We are much more concerned lest we should be ungrateful to God, who has loaded us with His

[1] Ps. xxvi. 2. [2] 2 Tim. ii. 5. [3] Matt. iv. 9, 10.

benefits, whose workmanship we are, who cares for us in whatever condition we may be, and who has given us hopes of things beyond this present life. And we have a symbol of gratitude to God in the bread which we call the Eucharist. Besides, as we have shown before, the demons have not the control of those things which have been created for our use; we commit no wrong, therefore, when we partake of created things, and yet refuse to offer sacrifices to beings who have no concern with them. Moreover, as we know that it is not demons, but angels, who have been set over the fruits of the earth, and over the birth of animals, it is the latter that we praise and bless, as having been appointed by God over the things needful for our race; yet even to them we will not give the honour which is due to God. For this would not be pleasing to God, nor would it be any pleasure to the angels themselves to whom these things have been committed. Indeed, they are much more pleased if we refrain from offering sacrifices to them than if we offer them; for they have no desire for the sacrificial odours which rise from the earth.

Chapter LVIII.

Celsus goes on to say: "Let any one inquire of the Egyptians, and he will find that everything, even to the most insignificant, is committed to the care of a certain demon. The body of man is divided into thirty-six parts, and as many demons of the air are appointed to the care of it, each having charge of a different part, although others make the number much larger. All these demons have in the language of that country distinct names; as Chnoumen, Chnachoumen, Cnat, Sicat, Biou, Erou, Erebiou, Ramanor, Reianoor, and other such Egyptian names. Moreover, they call upon them, and are cured of diseases of particular parts of the body. What, then, is there to prevent a man from giving honour to these or to others, if he would rather be in health than be sick, rather have prosperity than adversity, and be freed as much as possible from all plagues and troubles?" In this way, Celsus seeks to degrade our souls to the worship of demons, under the assumption that they have possession of our bodies, and that each one has power over a separate member. And he wishes us on this ground to put

confidence in these demons of which he speaks, and to serve them, in order that we may be in health rather than be sick, have prosperity rather than adversity, and may as far as possible escape all plagues and troubles. The honour of the Most High God, which cannot be divided or shared with another, is so lightly esteemed by him, that he cannot believe in the ability of God, if called upon and highly honoured, to give to those who serve Him a power by which they may be defended from the assaults directed by demons against the righteous. For he has never beheld the efficacy of those words, "in the name of Jesus," when uttered by the truly faithful, to deliver not a few from demons and demoniacal possessions and other plagues.

Chapter lix.

Probably those who embrace the views of Celsus will smile at us when we say, "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, of things on earth, and of things under the earth, and every tongue" is brought to "confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."[1] But although they may ridicule such a statement, yet they will receive much more convincing arguments in support of it than Celsus brings in behalf of Chnoumen, Chnachoumen, Cnat, Sicat, and the rest of the Egyptian catalogue, whom he mentions as being called upon, and as healing the diseases of different parts of the human body. And observe how, while seeking to turn us away from our faith in the God of all through Jesus Christ, he exhorts us for the welfare of our bodies to faith in six-and-thirty barbarous demons, whom the Egyptian magi alone call upon in some unknown way, and promise us in return great benefits. According to Celsus, then, it would be better for us now to give ourselves up to magic and sorcery than to embrace Christianity, and to put our faith in an innumerable multitude of demons than in the almighty, living, self-revealing God, who has manifested Himself by Him who by His great power has spread the true principles of holiness among all men throughout the world; yea, I may add without exaggeration, He has given this knowledge to all beings everywhere possessed of reason, and needing deliverance from the plague and corruption of sin.

[1] Phil. ii. 10, 11.

Chapter LX.

Celsus, however, suspecting that the tendency of such teaching as he here gives is to lead to magic, and dreading that harm may arise from these statements, adds: "Care, however, must be taken lest any one, by familiarizing his mind with these matters, should become too much engrossed with them, and lest, through an excessive regard for the body, he should have his mind turned away from higher things, and allow them to pass into oblivion. For perhaps we ought not to despise the opinion of those wise men who say that most of the earth-demons are taken up with carnal indulgence, blood, odours, sweet sounds, and other such sensual things; and therefore they are unable to do more than heal the body, or foretell the fortunes of men and cities, and do other such things as relate to this mortal life." If there is, then, such a dangerous tendency in this direction, as even the enemy of the truth of God confesses, how much better is it to avoid all danger of giving ourselves too much up to the power of such demons, and of becoming turned aside from higher things, and suffering them to pass into oblivion through an excessive attention to the body; by entrusting ourselves to the Supreme God through Jesus Christ, who has given us such instruction, and asking of Him all help, and the guardianship of holy and good angels, to defend us from the earth-spirits intent on lust, and blood, and sacrificial odours, and strange sounds, and other sensual things! For even, by the confession of Celsus, they can do nothing more than cure the body. But, indeed, I would say that it is not clear that these demons, however much they are reverenced, can even cure the body. But in seeking recovery from disease, a man must either follow the more ordinary and simple method, and have recourse to medical art; or if he would go beyond the common methods adopted by men, he must rise to the higher and better way of seeking the blessing of Him who is God over all, through piety and prayers.

Chapter LXI.

For consider with yourself which disposition of mind will be more acceptable to the Most High, whose power is supreme

and universal, and who directs all for the welfare of mankind in body, and in mind, and in outward things,—whether that of the man who gives himself up to God in all things, or that of the man who is curiously inquisitive about the names of demons, their powers and agency, the incantations, the herbs proper to them, and the stones with the inscriptions graven on them, corresponding symbolically or otherwise to their traditional shapes? It is plain even to the least intelligent, that the disposition of the man who is simple-minded, and not given to curious inquiries, but in all things devoted to the divine will, will be most pleasing to God, and to all those who are like God; but that of the man who, for the sake of bodily health, of bodily enjoyment, and outward prosperity, busies himself about the names of demons, and inquires by what incantations he shall appease them, will be condemned by God as bad and impious, and more agreeable to the nature of demons than of men, and will be given over to be torn and otherwise tormented by demons. For it is probable that they, as being wicked creatures, and, as Celsus confesses, addicted to blood, sacrificial odours, sweet sounds, and such like, will not keep their most solemn promises to those who supply them with these things. For if others invoke their aid against the persons who have already called upon them, and purchase their favour with a larger supply of blood, and odours, and such offerings as they require, they will take part against those who yesterday sacrificed and presented pleasant offerings to them.

Chapter lxii.

In a former passage, Celsus had spoken at length on the subject of oracles, and had referred us to their answers as being the voice of the gods; but now he makes amends, and confesses that "those who foretell the fortunes of men and cities, and concern themselves about mortal affairs, are earth-spirits, who are given up to fleshly lust, blood, odours, sweet sounds, and other such things, and who are unable to rise above these sensual objects." Perhaps, when we opposed the theological teaching of Celsus in regard to oracles, and the honour done to those called gods, some one might suspect us of impiety when we alleged that these were stratagems of demoniacal powers, to

draw men away to carnal indulgence. But any who entertained this suspicion against us, may now believe that the statements put forth by Christians were well-founded, when they see the above passage from the writings of one who is a professed adversary of Christianity, but who now at length writes as one who has been overcome by the spirit of truth. Although, therefore, Celsus says that "we must offer sacrifices to them, in so far as they are profitable to us, for to offer them indiscriminately is not allowed by reason," yet we are not to offer sacrifices to demons addicted to blood and odours; nor is the Divine Being to be profaned in our minds, by being brought down to the level of wicked demons. If Celsus had carefully weighed the meaning of the word "profitable," and had considered that the truest profit lies in virtue and in virtuous action, he would not have applied the phrase "as far as it is profitable" to the service of such demons, as he has acknowledged them to be. If, then, health of body and success in life were to come to us on condition of our serving such demons, we should prefer sickness and misfortune accompanied with the consciousness of our being truly devoted to the will of God. For this is preferable to being mortally diseased in mind, and wretched through being separate and outcasts from God, though healthy in body and abounding in earthly prosperity. And we would rather go for help to one who seeks nothing whatever but the well-being of men and of all rational creatures, than to those that delight in blood and sacrificial odours.

Chapter LXIII.

After having said so much of the demons, and of their fondness for blood and the odour of sacrifices, Celsus adds, as though wishing to retract the charge he had made: "The more just opinion is, that demons desire nothing and need nothing, but that they take pleasure in those who discharge towards them offices of piety." If Celsus believed this to be true, he should have said so, instead of making his previous statements. But, indeed, human nature is never utterly forsaken by God and His only-begotten Son, the truth. Wherefore even Celsus spoke the truth when he made the demons take pleasure in the blood and smoke of victims; although, by the

force of his own evil nature, he falls back into his errors, and compares demons with men who rigorously discharge every duty, even to those who show no gratitude; while to those who are grateful they abound in acts of kindness. Here Celsus appears to me to get into confusion. At one time his judgment is darkened by the influence of demons, and at another he recovers from their deluding power, and gets some glimpses of the truth. For again he adds: "We must never in any way lose our hold of God, whether by day or by night, whether in public or in secret, whether in word or in deed, but in whatever we do, or abstain from doing." That is, as I understand it, whatever we do in public, in all our actions, in all our words, "let the soul be constantly fixed upon God." And yet again, as though, after struggling in argument against the insane inspirations of demons, he were completely overcome by them, he adds: "If this is the case, what harm is there in gaining the favour of the rulers of the earth, whether of a nature different from ours, or human princes and kings? For these have gained their dignity through the instrumentality of demons." In a former part, Celsus did his utmost to debase our souls to the worship of demons; and now he wishes us to seek the favour of kings and princes, of whom, as the world and all history are full of them, I do not consider it necessary to quote examples.

Chapter LXIV.

There is therefore One whose favour we should seek, and to whom we ought to pray that He would be gracious to us—the Most High God, whose favour is gained by piety and the practice of every virtue. And if he would have us to seek the favour of others after the Most High God, let him consider that, as the motion of the shadow follows that of the body which casts it, so in like manner it follows, that when we have the favour of God, we have also the goodwill of all angels and spirits who are friends of God. For they know who are worthy of the divine approval, and they are not only well disposed to them, but they co-operate with them in their endeavours to please God: they seek His favour on their behalf; with their prayers they join their own prayers and intercessions for them. We

may indeed boldly say, that men who aspire after better things have, when they pray to God, tens of thousands of sacred powers upon their side. These, even when not asked, pray with them, they bring succour to our mortal race, and if I may so say, take up arms alongside of it: for they see demons warring and fighting most keenly against the salvation of those who devote themselves to God, and despise the hostility of demons; they see them savage in their hatred of the man who refuses to serve them with the blood and fumes of sacrifices, but rather strives in every way, by word and deed, to be in peace and union with the Most High through Jesus, who put to flight multitudes of demons when He went about "healing," and delivering "all who were oppressed by the devil."[1]

Chapter LXV.

Moreover, we are to despise ingratiating ourselves with kings or any other men, not only if their favour is to be won by murders, licentiousness, or deeds of cruelty, but even if it involves impiety towards God, or any servile expressions of flattery and obsequiousness, which things are unworthy of brave and high-principled men, who aim at joining with their other virtues that highest of virtues, patience and fortitude. But whilst we do nothing which is contrary to the law and word of God, we are not so mad as to stir up against us the wrath of kings and princes, which will bring upon us sufferings and tortures, or even death. For we read: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God."[2] These words we have in our exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, to the best of our ability, explained at length, and with various applications; but for the present we have taken them in their more obvious and generally received acceptation, to meet the saying of Celsus, that "it is not without the power of demons that kings have been raised to their regal dignity." Here much might be said on the constitution of kings and rulers, for the subject is a wide one, embracing such rulers as reign cruelly and tyrannically, and such as make the kingly office the means of indulging in luxury and sinful pleasures.

[1] Acts x. 38. [2] Rom. xiii. 1, 2.

We shall therefore, for the present, pass over the full consideration of this subject. We will, however, never swear by "the fortune of the king," nor by aught else that is considered equivalent to God. For if the word "fortune" is nothing but an expression for the uncertain course of events, as some say, although they seem not to be agreed, we do not swear by that as God which has no existence, as though it did really exist and was able to do something, lest we should bind ourselves by an oath to things which have no existence. If, on the other hand (as is thought by others, who say that to swear by the fortune of the king of the Romans is to swear by his demon), what is called the fortune of the king is in the power of demons, then in that case we must die sooner than swear by a wicked and treacherous demon, that ofttimes sins along with the man of whom it gains possession, and sins even more than he.

Chapter lxvi.

Then Celsus, following the example of those who are under the influence of demons—at one time recovering, at another relapsing, as though he were again becoming sensible—says: "If, however, any worshipper of God should be ordered to do anything impious, or to say anything base, such a command should in no wise be regarded; but we must encounter all kinds of torment, or submit to any kind of death, rather than say or even think anything unworthy of God." Again, however, from ignorance of our principles, and in entire confusion of thought, he says: "But if any one commands you to celebrate the sun, or to sing a joyful triumphal song in praise of Minerva, you will by celebrating their praises seem to render the higher praise to God; for piety, in extending to all things, becomes more perfect." To this our answer is, that we do not wait for any command to celebrate the praises of the sun; for we have been taught to speak well not only of those creatures that are obedient to the will of God, but even of our enemies. We therefore praise the sun as the glorious workmanship of God, which obeys His laws and hearkens to the call, "Praise the Lord, sun and moon,"[1] and with all your powers show forth the praises of the Father and Creator of all. Minerva, how-

[1] Ps. cxlviii. 3.

ever, whom Celsus classes with the sun, is the subject of various Grecian myths, whether these contain any hidden meaning or not. They say that Minerva sprang fully armed from the brain of Jupiter; that when she was pursued by Vulcan, she fled from him to preserve her honour; and that from the seed which fell to the ground in the heat of Vulcan's passion, there grew a child whom Minerva brought up and called Erichthonius,

> "That owed his nurture to the blue-eyed maid,
> But from the teeming furrow took his birth,
> The mighty offspring of the foodful earth."[1]

It is therefore evident, that if we admit Minerva the daughter of Jupiter, we must also admit many fables and fictions which can be allowed by no one who discards fables and seeks after truth.

Chapter LXVII.

And to regard these myths in a figurative sense, and consider Minerva as representing prudence, let any one show what were the actual facts of her history, upon which this allegory is based. For, supposing honour was given to Minerva as having been a woman of ancient times, by those who instituted mysteries and ceremonies for their followers, and who wished her name to be celebrated as that of a goddess, much more are we forbidden to pay divine honours to Minerva, if we are not permitted to worship so glorious an object as the sun, although we may celebrate its glory. Celsus, indeed, says that "we seem to do the greater honour to the great God when we sing hymns in honour of the sun and Minerva;" but we know it to be the opposite of that. For we sing hymns to the Most High alone, and His Only-begotten, who is the Word and God; and we praise God and His Only-begotten, as do also the sun, the moon, the stars, and all the host of heaven. For these all form a divine chorus, and unite with the just among men in celebrating the praises of the Most High God and His Only-begotten. We have already said that we must not swear by a human king, or by what is called "the fortune of the king." It is therefore unnecessary for us again to refute these statements: "If you are commanded to swear by a human king, there is nothing

[1] Homer's *Iliad*, ii. 547, 548.

wrong in that. For to him has been given whatever there is upon earth; and whatever you receive in this life, you receive from him." We deny, however, that all things which are on the earth have been given to the king, or that whatever we receive in this life we receive from him. For whatever we receive rightly and honourably we receive from God, and by His providence, as ripe fruits, and "corn which strengtheneth man's heart, and the pleasant vine, and wine which rejoiceth the heart of man."[1] And moreover, the fruit of the olive-tree, to make his face to shine, we have from the providence of God.

Chapter LXVIII.

Celsus goes on to say: "We must not disobey the ancient writer, who said long ago,

'Let one be king, whom the son of crafty Saturn appointed;'"[2]

and adds: "If you set aside this maxim, you will deservedly suffer for it at the hands of the king. For if all were to do the same as you, there would be nothing to prevent his being left in utter solitude and desertion, and the affairs of the earth would fall into the hands of the wildest and most lawless barbarians; and then there would no longer remain among men any of the glory of your religion or of the true wisdom." If, then, "there shall be one lord, one king," he must be, not the man "whom the son of crafty Saturn appointed," but the man to whom He gave the power, who "removeth kings and setteth up kings,"[3] and who "raiseth up the useful man in time of need upon earth."[4] For kings are not appointed by that son of Saturn, who, according to Grecian fable, hurled his father from his throne, and sent him down to Tartarus (whatever interpretation may be given to this allegory), but by God, who governs all things, and who wisely arranges whatever belongs to the appointment of kings. We therefore do set aside the maxim contained in the line,

"Whom the son of crafty Saturn appointed;"

for we know that no god or father of a god ever devises anything crooked or crafty. But we are far from setting aside the

[1] Ps. civ. 15.
[2] Homer's *Iliad*, ii. 205.
[3] Dan. ii. 21.
[4] Ecclus. x. 4.

notion of a providence, and of things happening directly or indirectly through the agency of providence. And the king will not "inflict deserved punishment" upon us, if we say that not the son of crafty Saturn gave him his kingdom, but He who "removeth and setteth up kings." And would that all were to follow my example in rejecting the maxim of Homer, maintaining the divine origin of the kingdom, and observing the precept to honour the king! In these circumstances the king will not "be left in utter solitude and desertion," neither will "the affairs of the world fall into the hands of the most impious and wild barbarians." For if, in the words of Celsus, "they do as I do," then it is evident that even the barbarians, when they yield obedience to the word of God, will become most obedient to the law, and most humane; and every form of worship will be destroyed except the religion of Christ, which will alone prevail. And indeed it will one day triumph, as its principles take possession of the minds of men more and more every day.

Chapter LXIX.

Celsus, then, as if not observing that he was saying anything inconsistent with the words he had just used, "if all were to do the same as you," adds: "You surely do not say that if the Romans were, in compliance with your wish, to neglect their customary duties to gods and men, and were to worship the Most High, or whatever you please to call him, that he will come down and fight for them, so that they shall need no other help than his. For this same God, as yourselves say, promised of old this and much more to those who served him, and see in what way he has helped them and you! They, in place of being masters of the whole world, are left with not so much as a patch of ground or a home; and as for you, if any of you transgresses even in secret, he is sought out and punished with death." As the question started is, "What would happen if the Romans were persuaded to adopt the principles of the Christians, to despise the duties paid to the recognised gods and to men, and to worship the Most High?" this is my answer to the question. We say that "if two" of us "shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for

them of the Father" of the just, "which is in heaven;"[1] for God rejoices in the agreement of rational beings, and turns away from discord. And what are we to expect, if not only a very few agree, as at present, but the whole of the empire of Rome? For they will pray to the Word, who of old said to the Hebrews, when they were pursued by the Egyptians, "The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace;"[2] and if they all unite in prayer with one accord, they will be able to put to flight far more enemies than those who were discomfited by the prayer of Moses when he cried to the Lord, and of those who prayed with him. Now, if what God promised to those who keep His law has not come to pass, the reason of its non-fulfilment is not to be ascribed to the unfaithfulness of God. But He had made the fulfilment of His promises to depend on certain conditions,—namely, that they should observe and live according to His law; and if the Jews have not a plot of ground nor a habitation left to them, although they had received these conditional promises, the entire blame is to be laid upon their crimes, and especially upon their guilt in the treatment of Jesus.

Chapter lxx.

But if all the Romans, according to the supposition of Celsus, embrace the Christian faith, they will, when they pray, overcome their enemies; or rather, they will not war at all, being guarded by that divine power which promised to save five entire cities for the sake of fifty just persons. For men of God are assuredly the salt of the earth: they preserve the order of the world; and society is held together as long as the salt is uncorrupted: for "if the salt have lost its savour, it is neither fit for the land nor for the dunghill; but it shall be cast out, and trodden under foot of men. He that hath ears, let him hear"[3] the meaning of these words. When God gives to the tempter permission to persecute us, then we suffer persecution; and when God wishes us to be free from suffering, even in the midst of a world that hates us, we enjoy a wonderful peace, trusting in the protection of Him who said, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the

[1] Matt. xviii. 19. [2] Ex. xiv. 14.
[3] Luke xiv. 34, 35; Matt. v. 13.

world."[1] And truly He has overcome the world. Wherefore the world prevails only so long as it is the pleasure of Him who received from the Father power to overcome the world; and from His victory we take courage. Should He even wish us again to contend and struggle for our religion, let the enemy come against us, and we will say to them, "I can do all things, through Christ Jesus our Lord, which strengtheneth me."[2] For of "two sparrows which are sold for a farthing," as the Scripture says, "not one of them falls on the ground without our Father in heaven."[3] And so completely does the divine providence embrace all things, that not even the hairs of our head fail to be numbered by Him.

Chapter lxxi.

Celsus again, as is usual with him, gets confused, and attributes to us things which none of us have ever written. His words are: "Surely it is intolerable for you to say, that if our present rulers, on embracing your opinions, are taken by the enemy, you will still be able to persuade those who rule after them; and after these have been taken you will persuade their successors, and so on, until at length, when all who have yielded to your persuasion have been taken, some prudent ruler shall arise, with a foresight of what is impending, and he will destroy you all utterly before he himself perishes." There is no need of any answer to these allegations: for none of us says of our present rulers, that if they embrace our opinions, and are taken by the enemy, we shall be able to persuade their successors; and when these are taken, those who come after them, and so on in succession. But on what does he ground the assertion, that when a succession of those who have yielded to our persuasion have been taken because they did not drive back the enemy, some prudent ruler shall arise, with a foresight of what is impending, who shall utterly destroy us? But here he seems to me to delight in inventing and uttering the wildest nonsense.

Chapter lxxii.

Afterwards he says: "If it were possible," implying at the same time that he thought it most desirable, "that all the inha-

[1] John xvi. 33. [2] Phil. iv. 13. [3] Matt. x. 29, 30.

bitants of Asia, Europe, and Libya, Greeks and barbarians, all to the uttermost ends of the earth, were to come under one law;" but judging this quite impossible, he adds, "Any one who thinks this possible, knows nothing." It would require careful consideration and lengthened argument to prove that it is not only possible, but that it will surely come to pass, that all who are endowed with reason shall come under one law. However, if we must refer to this subject, it will be with great brevity. The Stoics, indeed, hold that, when the strongest of the elements prevails, all things shall be turned into fire. But our belief is, that the Word shall prevail over the entire rational creation, and change every soul into His own perfection; in which state every one, by the mere exercise of his power, will choose what he desires, and obtain what he chooses. For although, in the diseases and wounds of the body, there are some which no medical skill can cure, yet we hold that in the mind there is no evil so strong that it may not be overcome by the Supreme Word and God. For stronger than all the evils in the soul is the Word, and the healing power that dwells in Him; and this healing He applies, according to the will of God, to every man. The consummation of all things is the destruction of evil, although as to the question whether it shall be so destroyed that it can never anywhere arise again, it is beyond our present purpose to say. Many things are said obscurely in the prophecies on the total destruction of evil, and the restoration to righteousness of every soul; but it will be enough for our present purpose to quote the following passage from Zephaniah: "Prepare and rise early; all the gleanings of their vineyards are destroyed. Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, on the day that I rise up for a testimony; for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kings, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy. For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent. From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants, even the daughter of my dispersed, shall bring my offering. In that day shalt thou not be ashamed for all thy doings, wherein thou hast transgressed against me: for then I will take away out of

the midst of thee them that rejoice in thy pride; and thou shalt no more be haughty because of my holy mountain. I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord. The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth: for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid."[1] I leave it to those who are able, after a careful study of the whole subject, to unfold the meaning of this prophecy, and especially to inquire into the signification of the words, "When the whole earth is destroyed, there will be turned upon the peoples a language according to their race,"[2] as things were before the confusion of tongues. Let them also carefully consider the promise, that all shall call upon the name of the Lord, and serve Him with one consent; also that all contemptuous reproach shall be taken away, and there shall be no longer any injustice, or vain speech, or a deceitful tongue. And thus much it seemed needful for me to say briefly, and without entering into elaborate details, in answer to the remark of Celsus, that he considered any agreement between the inhabitants of Asia, Europe, and Libya, as well Greeks as barbarians, was impossible. And perhaps such a result would indeed be impossible to those who are still in the body, but not to those who are released from it.

Chapter lxxiii.

In the next place, Celsus urges us "to help the king with all our might, and to labour with him in the maintenance of justice, to fight for him; and if he requires it, to fight under him, or lead an army along with him." To this our answer is, that we do, when occasion requires, give help to kings, and that, so to say, a divine help, "putting on the whole armour of God."[3] And this we do in obedience to the injunction of the apostle, "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority;"[4] and the

[1] Zeph. iii. 7-13.

[2] "A language to last as long as the world."—Bouhereau.

[3] Eph. vi. 11.

[4] 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

more any one excels in piety, the more effective help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can. And to those enemies of our faith who require us to bear arms for the commonwealth, and to slay men, we can reply: "Do not those who are priests at certain shrines, and those who attend on certain gods, as you account them, keep their hands free from blood, that they may with hands unstained and free from human blood offer the appointed sacrifices to your gods; and even when war is upon you, you never enlist the priests in the army. If that, then, is a laudable custom, how much more so, that while others are engaged in battle, these too should engage as the priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure, and wrestling in prayers to God on behalf of those who are fighting in a righteous cause, and for the king who reigns righteously, that whatever is opposed to those who act righteously may be destroyed!" And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings than those who go into the field to fight for them. And we do take our part in public affairs, when along with righteous prayers we join self-denying exercises and meditations, which teach us to despise pleasures, and not to be led away by them. And none fight better for the king than we do. We do not indeed fight under him, although he require it; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army—an army of piety—by offering our prayers to God.

Chapter LXXIV.

And if Celsus would have us to lead armies in defence of our country, let him know that we do this too, and that not for the purpose of being seen by men, or of vainglory. For "in secret," and in our own hearts, there are prayers which ascend as from priests in behalf of our fellow-citizens. And Christians are benefactors of their country more than others. For they train up citizens, and inculcate piety to the Supreme Being; and they promote those whose lives in the smallest cities have been good and worthy, to a divine and heavenly city, to whom it may be said, "Thou hast been faithful in the smallest city,

come into a great one,"[1] where "God standeth in the assembly of the gods, and judgeth the gods in the midst;" and He reckons thee among them, if thou no more "die as a man, or fall as one of the princes."[2]

Chapter lxxv.

Celsus also urges us to "take office in the government of the country, if that is required for the maintenance of the laws and the support of religion." But we recognise in each state the existence of another national organization,[3] founded by the Word of God, and we exhort those who are mighty in word and of blameless life to rule over churches. Those who are ambitious of ruling we reject; but we constrain those who, through excess of modesty, are not easily induced to take a public charge in the church of God. And those who rule over us well are under the constraining influence of the great King, whom we believe to be the Son of God, God the Word. And if those who govern in the church, and are called rulers of the divine nation—that is, the church—rule well, they rule in accordance with the divine commands, and never suffer themselves to be led astray by worldly policy. And it is not for the purpose of escaping public duties that Christians decline public offices, but that they may reserve themselves for a diviner and more necessary service in the church of God—for the salvation of men. And this service is at once necessary and right. They take charge of all—of those that are within, that they may day by day lead better lives, and of those that are without, that they may come to abound in holy words and in deeds of piety; and that, while thus worshipping God truly, and training up as many as they can in the same way, they may be filled with the word of God and the law of God, and thus be united with the supreme God through His Son the Word, wisdom, truth, and righteousness, who unites to God all who are resolved to conform their lives in all things to the law of God.

Chapter lxxvi.

You have here, reverend Ambrosius, the conclusion of what we have been enabled to accomplish by the power given to us

[1] Luke xix. 17. [2] Ps. lxxxii. 1, 7. [3] σύστημα πατρίδος.

in obedience to your command. In eight books we have embraced all that we considered it proper to say in reply to that book of Celsus which he entitles *A True Discourse.* And now it remains for the readers of his discourse and of my reply to judge which of the two breathes most of the Spirit of the true God, of piety towards Him, and of that truth which leads men by sound doctrines to the noblest life. You must know, however, that Celsus had promised another treatise as a sequel to this one, in which he engaged to supply practical rules of living to those who felt disposed to embrace his opinions. If, then, he has not fulfilled his promise of writing a second book, we may well be contented with these eight books which we have written in answer to his discourse. But if he has begun and finished that second book, pray obtain it and send it to us, that we may answer it as the Father of truth may give us ability, and either overthrow the false teaching that may be in it, or laying aside all jealousy, we may testify our approval of whatever truth it may contain.

Glory be to Thee, our God; Glory be to Thee.

INDEXES.

I.—INDEX OF PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.

	VOL. PAGE
i. 1,	i. 127, 271
i. 2,	i. 349
i. 11,	ii. 519
i. 24,	i. 110
i. 26,	i. 262, ii. 190, 391
i. 27,	ii. 190
i. 27, 28,	i. 263
ii. 2, 3,	ii. 403
ii. 4,	ii. 403
ii. 7,	i. 39, ii. 200
ii. 21, 22,	ii. 201
ii. 24,	i. 109, ii. 216, 389
iii.,	i. 222, ii. 383
iii. 5,	ii. 461
iii. 6,	ii. 461
iii. 7,	ii. 461
iii. 8,	ii. 406
iii. 17,	ii. 451
iii. 19,	i. 269
iii. 24,	ii. 391
iv. 8,	ii. 208
iv. 10,	i. 251
v. 1,	ii. 390
v. 3,	i. 23, 119
vi. 3,	i. 39, ii. 460
vi. 5, 6,	ii. 400
ix. 10, 11,	ii. 70
xi. 1, 2,	ii. 297
xi. 4,	ii. 161
xi. 5-7,	ii. 298
xv. 5,	ii. 277
xvii. 14,	i. 318
xix. 17,	ii. 211
xxi. 2,	ii. 208
xxvi. 15,	ii. 210
xxvii. 12, 13.	ii. 359
xxvii. 27,	i. 449
xxx. 42,	ii. 209
xxx. 43,	ii. 209
xlviii. 22,	i. 323
xlix. 1,	i. 253
xlix.,	i. 456

EXODUS.

	VOL. PAGE
iii. 2,	i. 122
iii. 6,	i. 92
iii. 8,	ii. 451
iii. 14,	i. 38
iv. 21,	i. 169
iv. 23,	i. 175
iv. 24, 25,	ii. 318
iv. 24-26,	i. 222
iv. 25, 26,	ii. 319
vii. 3,	i. 169
viii. 28, 29,	i. 179
ix. 12,	i. 175
ix. 17,	i. 175
xii. 8,	ii. 510
xii. 23,	i. 223, ii. 383
xvi. 29,	i. 319
xviii. 4,	ii. 318
xix. 19,	i. 216
xx. 3, 4,	ii. 485
xx. 12,	i. 94, 324 *bis*
xx. 13,	i. 324
xx. 18,	ii. 404
xx. 21,	ii. 355
xxi. 2,	ii. 318
xxi. 24,	ii. 448
xxii. 28,	ii. 523
xxiii. 20,	i. 96
xxiv. 2,	ii. 263, 356
xxv. 5,	i. 293
xxv. 40,	i. 272
xxx. 34, 35,	ii. 273
xxxii.,	i. 281
xxxii. 4,	ii. 77
xxxii. 21,	i. 281
xxxiv. 2,	ii. 59
xxxv. 2,	i. 387
xxxv. 40,	i. 306

LEVITICUS.

	VOL. PAGE
xi. 44,	ii. 406
xvi. 8,	ii. 383
xvi. 18,	i. 223
xvi. 29,	ii. 510
xvii. 10,	i. 119
xvii. 14,	i. 118, 246
xix. 26,	ii. 262
xix. 31,	i. 424, ii. 276
xxvi. 5,	ii. 447

NUMBERS.

	VOL. PAGE
xv. 32,	i. 387
xxiii. 23,	ii. 262
xxiv. 17,	i. 463, 464

DEUTERONOMY.

	VOL. PAGE
i. 10,	ii. 277
ii. 34,	ii. 443
iii. 1-3,	ii. 56
iii. 8,	ii. 406
iv. 16-18,	ii. 193
iv. 19,	ii. 193, 274
iv. 19, 20,	ii. 277
iv. 24,	i. 8, 122, ii. 173
vi. 13,	ii. 279, 485
viii. 3,	i. 148
ix. 3,	ii. 173
x. 12, 13,	ii. 40
xiii. 4,	ii. 456
xvi. 3,	ii. 510
xviii. 14,	i. 436 *bis*, ii. 262
xviii. 15,	i. 436, ii. 262
xxiv. 16,	ii. 524
xxv. 4,	i. 94, 304, ii. 216
xxviii.,	i. 142, 304
xxviii. 12,	ii. 444
xxviii. 66,	ii. 79
xxxii. 8,	i. 46
xxxii. 8, 9,	ii. 169, 297
xxxii. 9,	i. 46
xxxii. 21,	ii. 83, 151
xxxii. 23, 24,	i. 434
xxxii. 30,	ii. 444

	VOL. PAGE
xxxii. 39, .	ii. 31
xxxiv. 5, 6, .	ii. 57
JOSHUA.	
xxiv. 32, .	i. 323
1 SAMUEL.	
ix. 10, . .	i. 436
xv. 11, . .	i. 293
xvi. 15, . .	i. 293
xviii. 10, .	i. 293
2 SAMUEL.	
xxii. 44, 45, .	ii. 83
1 KINGS.	
iii. 16, .	i. 382, 383
iv. 29-34, .	ii. 127
x. 1-9, . .	ii. 126
xii. 14, . .	i. 389
xiv. 12, . .	i. 436
xvii. 21, 22, .	ii. 61
xix. 18, .	i. 308
xxii. 19-23, .	i. 223
2 KINGS.	
i. 3, . .	i. 436
iv. 34, 35, .	ii. 61
ix. 11, . .	ii. 434
1 CHRONICLES.	
xvi. 8, . .	i. 387
xvi. 22, . .	ii. 422
JOB.	
i. and ii., .	ii. 283
i. 10, 11, .	i. 235
ii. 10, . .	ii. 396
vii. 1, . .	i. 236
viii. 12, . .	i. 113
x. 8, . .	ii. 200
xv. 14, .	i. 347, ii. 143
xxv. 5, . .	i. 61
xl., . .	i. 284
xl. 20, .	i. 53, ii. 384
xli., . .	i. 284
xli. 34, . .	i. 123
PSALMS.	
i. 1, . .	i. 383
ii. 2, . .	i. 239
ii. 3, . .	ii. 538
ii. 5, . .	i. 97
ii. 8, . .	ii. 169
iv. 6, . .	ii. 341
vi. 1, . .	ii. 237
vii. 3-5, . .	ii. 447
vii. 3-6, . .	ii. 521
viii. 3, . .	i. 89
ix. 13, 14, .	ii. 375
xiii. 3, . .	ii. 456
xiv. 3, 4, .	ii. 418
xvi. 9, 10, .	ii. 65, 113
xviii. 11, .	ii. 355
xix. 1, . .	ii. 404
xix. 4, . .	i. 467
xix. 8, . .	ii. 456
xxii. 15, .	ii. 473
xxii. 20, 21, .	i. 120
xxiv. 8, .	ii. 492
xxvi. 2, .	ii. 541
xxvii. 1, .	ii. 341
xxvii. 1-3, .	i. 234
xxvii. 1, 3, .	ii. 513
xxxiii., . .	ii. 402
xxxiii. 5, .	ii. 188
xxxiii. 6, .	i. 40, 345
xxxiv. 7,	i. 66, ii. 380, 520, 522
xxxiv. 10-14, .	ii. 396
xxxiv. 19, .	ii. 441
xxxvi. 9,	i. 8, ii. 341
xxxvii. 8, .	ii. 238
xxxvii. 9, 11, 22, 29, 34, .	ii. 452
xxxvii. 30, 31,	ii. 472
xxxvii. 34, .	i. 90
xxxix. 5, .	ii. 473
xliii. 19, .	ii. 473
xliv. 19, .	i. 126
xliv. 23, .	ii. 238
xlv. 1, 2, .	i. 282
xlv. 2-5, .	i. 459
xlv. 6, 7, .	i. 459
xlv. 7, .	i. 109, 111, 347
xlv. 8, . .	i. 111
xlv. 25, . .	ii. 473
xlviii. 1, 2, .	ii. 452
xlix. 9, 10, .	ii. 351
l. 1, . .	ii. 493
li. 5, . .	ii. 472
li. 10, . .	i. 34
li. 11, . .	ii. 468
li. 12, . .	ii. 455
liv. 5, .	i. 478, ii. 425
liv. 6, . .	ii. 425
lviii. 3, . .	ii. 472
lxii. 1, . .	i. 283
lxiii. 8, . .	ii. 456
lxviii. 11, .	i. 467
lxix. 21, .	ii. 41, 436
lxxii. 7, .	i. 283
lxxii. 8, .	i. 283
lxxii. 11, .	i. 115
lxxiii. 1, .	i. 104
lxxvi. 2, .	ii. 452
lxxvi. 10, .	i. 230
lxxvii. 2, .	ii. 8, 456
lxxviii. 34, .	i. 102
lxxviii. 49, .	ii. 517
lxxviii. 65, .	ii. 238
lxxx. 13, 14, .	i. 166
lxxxi. 5, .	ii. 91
lxxxii. 1,	ii. 189 *bis*, 493
lxxxii. 1, 7, .	ii. 558
lxxxiv. 3, .	i. 230
lxxxvi. 8, .	ii. 271
lxxxvii. 1, 2, .	ii. 216
lxxxix. 32, .	ii. 398
lxxxix. 50, 51,	ii. 112
xci. 13, . .	ii. 490
xcvi. 4, . .	ii. 271
xcvi. 5, .	ii. 189, 489, 493
xcvii. 6, .	i. 124
xcvii. 9, .	ii. 493
ci. 9, . .	ii. 442
cii. 25, . .	ii. 404
cii. 26, 27,	i. 254, 271, ii. 223
cii. 27, .	i. 419, ii. 174, 405
cii. 46, . .	i. 58
civ. 4, . .	i. 122
civ. 6, . .	ii. 356
civ. 14, 15, .	ii. 241
civ. 15, . .	ii. 551
civ. 24, . .	i. 29, 130
civ. 24-26, .	ii. 263
civ. 29, 30, .	i. 39
cv. 15, . .	ii. 422
cvi. 20, . .	ii. 36
cvii. 20,	i. 470, ii. 143, 279
cix., . .	ii. 27
cix. 1, 2, .	ii. 16
cix. 8, . .	ii. 16
cx. 1, . .	i. 154
cxv. 13, .	i. 383
cxvi., . .	ii. 539
cxviii. 2, .	i. 104
cxviii. 19, 20,	ii. 375
cxix. 18, .	ii. 8, 216, 456
cxix. 73, .	ii. 200
cxix. 105, .	ii. 341
cxxvi., . .	i. 205
cxxxi. 1, 2, .	ii. 353
cxxxvi. 2,	ii. 271, 493
cxxxvii. 8, 9,	ii. 445
cxxxix., .	i. 351
cxli., .	ii. 140, 505
cxlvii. 15, .	i. 467
cxlviii. 3,	ii. 281, 549
cxlviii. 4, .	ii. 358
cxlviii. 4, 5, .	ii. 315
cxlviii. 5, .	i. 77

VOL. PAGE

PROVERBS.

ii. 5, . i. 17, 355, ii. 448, 457
iv. 23, . . i. 232
v. 15-17, . ii. 210
viii. 5, . . ii. 134
viii. 22-15, . i. 18
ix. 1-5, . . i. 147
ix. 4, . . ii. 134
ix. 5, 6, . ii. 134
x. 17, . . ii. 343
x. 19, . . ii. 268
xiii. 8, . ii. 144
xiii. 25, . ii. 447
xxii. 20, 21, . i. 300
xxii. 28, . ii. 374
xxiii. 5, . ii. 384
xxvii. 19, . ii. 386
xxviii. 6, . ii. 446
xxx. 24-28, . ii. 253

ECCLESIASTES.

i. 1-14, . . . i. 64
i. 2, . . ii. 472
i. 6, . . ii. 374
i. 9, . i. 255, ii. 172
x. 4, . i. 223, 230

SONG.

i. 3, . . . i. 11

ISAIAH.

i. 4, . . ii. 79
i. 7, . . ii. 80
i. 11, . . i. 140
i. 13, 14, . i. 119
i. 19, 20, i. 165, ii. 399
i. 20, . . ii. 404
ii. 2, . . i. 386
iii. 24, . . i. 86
iv. 4, . . i. 143
v. 8, . . ii. 79
v. 11, . . ii. 79
v. 12, . . ii. 453
v. 18, . . ii. 79
v. 20, . . ii. 79, 410
v. 22, . . ii. 79
vi. 1, 2, . i. 443
vi. 2, . . ii. 357
vi. 3, . . i. 25, 340
vi. 9, . . ii. 10
vii. 10-14, . i. 434
vii. 11, . . i. 435
vii. 14, . . i. 435
vii. 15, . . i. 292
vii. 16, . . i. 110
viii. 4, . . i. 110
viii. 8, 9, . i. 283
ix. 2, . ii. 341 *bis*, 409, 538

VOL. PAGE

ix. 6, . ii. 323, 513
x. 17, . i. 143, 349
xi. 6, 7, . i. 292
xiv. 4, . . ii. 384
xiv. 12-22, . i. 52
xxv. 8, . . i. 80
xxvii. 1, i. 123, 224
xxviii. 19, . ii. 530
xxxv. 5, 6, . ii. 49
xli. 22, 23, . i. 340
xlii. 4, . . i. 456
xlii. 5, . . i. 35
xliv. 11-14, . ii. 507
xlv. 3, . . i. 335
xlv. 6, . . i. 92
xlv. 7, . i. 293, ii. 396, 398
xlv. 12, . i. 61
xlvii. 14, 15, . i. 102, 143, ii. 283, 398
xlviii. 9, . ii. 283
xlviii. 16, . i. 456
xlix. 8, 9, . i. 456
xlix. 9, . i. 456, ii. 538
xlix. 12, . ii. 257
lii. 3, 15, . i. 457
lii. 12, . ii. 539
liii. 1-3, . ii. 418
liii. 1-8, . i. 457
liii. 2, 3, . ii. 439
liii. 7, . ii. 62
liii. 9, . i. 110
liv. 12, 11, . ii. 452
lx. 1, . ii. 341
lx. 19, . ii. 393
lxiii. 17, 18, . i. 182
lxiv. 8, . i. 267
lxv. 1, . ii. 83
lxvi. 1, . i. 74, 92
lxvi. 2, . i. 89
lxvi. 16, . i. 143
lxvi. 22, . i. 255

JEREMIAH.

i. 5, 6, . . i. 242
i. 9, . . i. 122
i. 9, 10, . ii. 161
i. 14, . . i. 123
vii. 17, 18, . ii. 275
vii. 18, . . i. 62
x. 24, . . ii. 237
xiii. 24, . ii. 172
xv. 14, . i. 293
xvii. 21-24, . i. 387
xx. 7, . i. 182, 397
xxiii. 23, . ii. 280
xxiii. 24, i. 74, ii. 166, 280
xxv. 15, 16, . i. 143

VOL. PAGE

xxv. 28, 29, . i. 143
xxix. 22, . i. 376
xxxi. 10, . ii. 526
xxxiv. 14, . ii. 313

LAMENTATIONS.

iii. 25, . . i. 104
iii. 27, 29, 30, ii. 448
iii. 34, . . ii. 538
iii. 38, . . ii. 232
iv. 20, . i. 112, 339

EZEKIEL.

i., . . i. 357
i. 1, . . i. 443
i. 19, 20, . i. 169
i. 28, . . i. 443
ii. 1, . . i. 443
ii. 6, . . ii. 80
ii. 9, 10, . ii. 342
iii. 2, 3, . i. 449
x., . . ii. 357
xi. 19, 20, . i. 191
xvi. 55, . i. 102
xviii. 2-4, . ii. 525
xviii. 3, . ii. 99
xviii. 4, . i. 123
xviii. 4, 19, . i. 123
xviii. 20, . ii. 524
xx. 3, . . ii. 127
xx. 5, . . ii. 525
xx. 25, . . ii. 443
xxii. 18, 20, . ii. 283
xxvi., . . i. 239
xxviii. 11-19, i. 50
xxviii. 12, . i. 224
xxviii. 15, . ii. 385
xxviii. 19, . ii. 385
xxix. 3, . ii. 217 *bis*
xxxii. 1-28, . ii. 384
xxxii. 2, . i. 123
xxxii. 6, . ii. 217
xliii.-xlvi., . i. 387
xlviii., . . ii. 361

DANIEL.

ii. 21, . . ii. 551
iv. 8, . . i. 34
iv. 37, . . ii. 453
vii. 10, . ii. 173, 519
vii. 26, . . ii. 52
viii. 23, . ii. 385
viii. 23-25, . ii. 388
ix. 24, . . i. 284
ix. 27, . . ii. 388
x., . . i. 239
xii. 1, 2, 3, . ii. 277
xii. 3, . . ii. 191

VOL. PAGE

HOSEA.

iii. 4, . . i. 279
viii. 12, . ii. 340
x. 9, . . ii. 127
x. 12, . . i. 7
xiii. 14, i. 80, ii. 127
xiv. 9, . . ii. 217

JOEL.

ii. 28, . . . 150

AMOS.

iii. 6, . . i. 293
ix. 3, . . i. 123

MICAH.

i. 12, . i. 293, ii. 398
i. 12, 13, . ii. 396
iv. 1, . . i. 387
v. 2, . i. 284, 453
vi. 8, . . i. 165

HABAKKUK.

iii. 2, . . i. 36

ZEPHANIAH.

iii. 7-13, . ii. 556

HAGGAI.

ii. 6, . . ii. 453

ZECHARIAH.

i. 14, . . i. 230
iii. 1, . . i. 224
v. 7, . . ii. 363
ix. 10, . . i. 292

MALACHI.

iii. 2, . ii. 173, 283
iii. 2, 3, . ii. 364
iii. 3, . . i. 143
iii. 6, . i. 419, ii. 174, 405

APOCRYPHA.

TOBIT.

i. 12, . . i. 384
i. 19, . . i. 385
i. 22, . . i. 385
ii. 3, . . i. 370
xii. 7, . ii. 287, 298

WISDOM.

i. 4, . ii. 140, 298
i. 5, . . ii. 432
i. 7, . . ii. 166
vii. 16, . . i. 191
vii. 25, . . i. 22
vii. 25, 26, . i. 26, ii. 150, 502
ix. 6, . . ii. 350
x. 5, . . ii. 298
x. 19, . . ii. 534
xi. 17, . . i. 349
xi. 20, . . i. 127
xi. 26, . . ii. 188
xii. 1, . . ii. 201
xii. 1, 2, ii. 188, 473
xvii. 1, . . ii. 518
xviii. 24, . i. 86

ECCLESIASTICUS.

vi. 4, . . i. 123
x. 4, . . ii. 551
xvi. 21, . i. 341
xviii. 13, . ii. 188
xxi. 18, . ii. 344, 435
xxxix. 21, 16, 17, ii. 242
xliii. 20, . i. 123

SUSANNAH.

Ver. 52, 53, . i. 376
Ver. 56, . i. 377

SONG OF THE THREE HOLY CHILDREN, i. 372

2 MACCABEES.

vii. 28, . . i. 77

NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.

i. 20, . . i. 472
i. 23, . . i. 434
ii. 6, . i. 284, 453
ii. 13, . . i. 472
iii. 17, . . ii. 76
iv. 9, 10, . ii. 541
iv. 10, . . ii. 485
iv. 12, . . i. 170
iv. 16, . . i. 170
iv. 19, . . i. 466
v. 3, . . ii. 409
v. 5, . . i. 90
v. 6, . . i. 146
v. 8, . i. 17, ii. 340, 455, 466
v. 13, . . ii. 553
v. 14, . ii. 278, 474
v. 16, . . ii. 278
v. 22, . . i. 166, 325
v. 28, . . i. 325
v. 34, . . i. 74
v. 34, 35, . i. 92
v. 39, . i. 166, ii. 448
v. 39, 40, . ii. 482
v. 44, 45, . ii. 521
v. 45, . . ii. 188
v. 48, . i. 355, ii. 190
v. 48, 49, . i. 91
vi. 9, . . i. 92
vi. 24, . . ii. 493
vi. 25-28, . ii. 447
vii. 7, . . i. 390
vii. 14, . . ii. 354
vii. 18, . . i. 103
vii. 22, . . i. 402
vii. 22, 23, i. 278, ii. 51
vii. 24, . . i. 166
vii. 26, . . i. 167
viii. 3, . . i. 449
ix. 12, . . ii. 141
ix. 23, . . ii. 446
ix. 37, 38, . i. 468
x. 3, . . i. 466
x. 18, i. 278, ii. 18, 19
x. 23, . . i. 471
x. 29, . . i. 236
x. 29, 30, . ii. 554
xi. 20, . . ii. 253
xi. 27, . i. 16, 96, 106, ii. 466
xi. 28, . ii. 77, 143
xi. 29, . . ii. 8
xii. 24, . . ii. 13
xii. 32, . . i. 34
xii. 33, . . i. 103
xii. 35, . . i. 104
xii. 42, . . i. 237, 238
xii. 44, . . i. 334
xiii. 9, . . ii. 456
xiii. 54, . ii. 354
xv. 11, 17-19, ii. 515
xv. 19, . . ii. 455
xv. 24, . . i. 329
xvii. 9, . . i. 450
xviii. 10, i. 329, ii. 380, 520, 522
xviii. 19, . ii. 553
xviii. 20, . ii. 12
xix. 14, . . i. 254
xix. 17, . i. 104, ii. 279
xix. 24, . . ii. 354
xx. 25, . . ii. 446
xx. 28, . . ii. 191
xxi. 2, . . ii. 208
xxii. 12, 13, . i. 100
xxii. 30, i. 345, ii. 189
xxii. 32, i. 92, ii. 494
xxii. 37, 39, 40, i. 93
xxiii. 12, . ii. 142
xxiii. 29-36, . i. 378
xxiii. 30, . i. 397
xxiii. 34, . ii. 127
xxiv. 4, . . ii. 385
xxiv. 12, . i. 122
xxiv. 14, i. 278, ii. 20

VOL. PAGE

xxiv. 21, . i. 256
xxiv. 23-27, . ii. 51
xxiv. 27, . i. 52
xxiv. 35, i. 254, ii. 291
xxv. 4, . . ii. 341
xxv. 29, . i. 149
xxv. 34, . i. 167
xxv. 35, . i. 169
xxvi. 3, . . i. 105
xxvi. 23, . ii. 28
xxvi. 29, . i. 146
xxvi. 38, . i. 125, 346; ii. 11
xxvi. 39, ii. 30, 31, 477
xxvi. 48, . ii. 67
xxvi. 52-54, . ii. 14
xxvi. 55, . ii. 67
xxvi. 59-61, . i. 394
xxvi. 61, . ii. 13
xxvii. 3-5, . ii. 15
xxvii. 11-14, . ii. 394
xxvii. 17, . i. 394
xxvii. 18, . i. 394
xxvii. 19, . ii. 39
xxvii. 46-50, . ii. 113
xxvii. 51, 52, ii. 38
xxvii. 54, . ii. 41
xxvii. 60, . ii. 72
xxvii. 63, . i. 235
xxviii. 1, 2, . ii. 74
xxviii. 9, . ii. 74
xxviii. 20, . ii. 12, 280

MARK.

i. 12, . . ii. 6
iii. 18, . . i. 466
iv. 12, . . i. 194
vi. 2, . . ii. 354
vi. 3, . . ii. 375
x. 8, . . i. 109
x. 18, . . ii. 279
x. 44, . . ii. 446
xiii. 31, . . ii. 291

LUKE.

i. 35, . . i. 34, 113
v. 8, . . i. 468
vi. 36, . . i. 355
vi. 4, . . i. 25
viii. 10, . . i. 170
x. 4, . . i. 320
x. 18, . . i. 52
x. 19, i. 284, ii. 479, 490
x. 22, . i. 36, ii. 75
xi. 9, . . i. 39
xi. 48, . . ii. 79
xi. 52, . . i. 299
xii. 10, . . i. 34
xii. 45, 46, . i. 376
xiii. 11, 16, . ii. 538

VOL. PAGE

xiii. 26, 27, . ii. 51
xiv. 11, . . i. 185
xiv. 34, 35, . ii. 553
xvii. 20, 21, . i. 38
xviii. 11, . ii. 144
xviii. 13, . ii. 144
xviii. 14, . ii. 144
xix. 14, . . i. 97
xix. 17, . . ii. 558
xix. 17, 19, . i. 147
xix. 26, . . i. 149
xx. 36, . i. 345, ii. 189
xxii. 25, . ii. 446
xxii. 27, . ii. 8
xxiii. 21, 25, . ii. 526
xxiii. 44, 45, . ii. 38
xxiii. 53, . ii. 72 *bis*
xxiv. 15, 31, . ii. 65
xxiv. 30, 31, . ii. 71

JOHN.

i. 1, . ii. 293, 408, 456, 496
i. 1, 2, . . i. 130
i. 1-3, . . i. 59
i. 3, . i. 329, 345
i. 3, 4, . . ii. 341
i. 5, . . ii. 75, 474
i. 9, . . ii. 404
i. 14, . . ii. 411
i. 18, . i. 16, 95, ii. 75, 450
i. 26, . . ii. 12
i. 26, 27, i. 346, ii. 280
i. 32-34, . . i. 449
i. 52, . . i. 450
ii. 16, . . i. 92
ii. 19, . . ii. 113
ii. 19, 21, . ii. 507
iii. 8, . . ii. 36
iv. 19, . . i. 31
iv. 20, . . i. 10
iv. 21, . . i. 8
iv. 21-24, . ii. 413
iv. 23, 24, . i. 10
iv. 24, . . i. 75
v. 23, . . ii. 498
v. 31, . . i. 450
v. 39, i. 325, ii. 44, 284
v. 46, 47, . ii. 6
vii. 15, . . ii. 354
vii. 42, . . i. 453
viii. 40, i. 472, ii. 32, 439
viii. 46, . . i. 110
viii. 58, . . ii. 500
ix. 39, . . ii. 461
x. 3, . . i. 390
x. 8-10, . . ii. 490

VOL. PAGE

x. 18, . i. 108, 125, 346, ii. 23, 113
x. 24, . . i. 450
x. 30, . . ii. 500
xii. 24, . . ii. 527
xii. 27, . . i. 125, 346
xiii. 2, . . i. 232
xiii. 27, . . i. 224
xiv. 2, . i. 152, ii. 359
xiv. 6, i. 1, ii. 409, 500
xiv. 9, . . i. 24, 93
xiv. 11, . . ii. 500
xiv. 16, . . i. 472
xiv. 23, . i. 9, ii. 506
xiv. 26, . . i. 36
xiv. 27, . . ii. 502
xiv. 28, . . ii. 502
xiv. 30, . . i. 110
xv. 22, . . i. 38
xvi. 4, . . ii. 8
xvi. 12, 13, . i. 36, ii. 3
xvi. 28, . . ii. 254
xvi. 33, . i. 233, ii. 401, 554
xvii. 10, . i. 29
xvii. 16, . i. 87
xvii. 20, 21, . i. 56
xvii. 21, . ii. 500
xvii. 22, . ii. 50
xvii. 22, 23, . i. 56
xvii. 24 (21, 22), i. 85, 263
xvii. 25, . i. 104
xviii. 4, etc., . ii. 14
xviii. 36, . i. 465
xix. 2, . . i. 242
xix. 11, . . i. 235
xix. 34, 35, . ii. 40
xix. 41, . ii. 72 *bis*
xix. 52, . . ii. 23
xx. 22, i. 34, 39, ii. 473
xx. 26, . . ii. 66
xx. 26, 27, . ii. 65
xx. 27, . . ii. 64
xxi. 18, . . ii. 47

ACTS.

i. 3, . . ii. 66
i. 5, . . ii. 474
i. 8, . . i. 40
iv. 32, . . i. 500
v. 36, 37, . ii. 349
v. 38, 39, . i. 461
v. 41, . . ii. 47
vii., . . i. 98
vii. 22, . . ii. 128
vii. 42, 43, . ii. 275
vii. 52, . . i. 379
viii. 10, . . ii. 348

	VOL. PAGE
viii. 18,	i. 34
ix. 15,	i. 233
x. 9-15,	ii. 2
x. 14,	ii. 319
x. 38,	ii. 548
xv. 28, 29,	ii. 515
xvii. 28,	i. 74, ii. 166
xxi. 26,	ii. 3

ROMANS.

i. 1-4,	i. 94
i. 3, 4,	i. 248
i. 14,	ii. 134
i. 18-23,	ii. 339
i. 19,	ii. 129, 192
i. 20,	ii. 401, 459
i. 20-22,	ii. 129
i. 21,	ii. 129, 470
i. 21-23,	ii. 192
i. 22, 23,	ii. 152
i. 23,	ii. 498
i. 24, 25,	ii. 471
i. 24, 26, 28,	ii. 301
i. 25,	ii. 340, 470
i. 26-28,	ii. 129
i. 27,	ii. 472
i. 28,	ii. 471
ii. 4, 5,	i. 181
ii. 4-10,	i. 168
ii. 11,	i. 63, 69
ii. 13-16,	i. 141
ii. 23,	ii. 498
ii. 28,	i. 327
ii. 29,	ii. 445
v. 7,	ii. 189
v. 8,	ii. 188
v. 14,	ii. 206
vi. 4,	ii. 72
vi. 9,	ii. 23
vi. 10,	ii. 72
vii. 9,	ii. 142
vii. 12,	i. 103
vii. 12, 14,	ii. 444
vii. 13,	i. 103
vii. 23,	i. 246, 251
vii. 24,	ii. 473, 539
viii. 2,	i. 251
viii. 7,	i. 252
viii. 8,	ii. 460
viii. 9,	i. 247, ii. 468
viii. 13,	ii. 320, 460, 475
viii. 14,	ii. 262
viii. 16,	ii. 460
viii. 19,	i. 63
viii. 19, 20,	ii. 495
viii. 19-21,	ii. 281 *bis*, 486
viii. 20,	ii. 472
viii. 20, 21,	i. 63, 135, 254, 258-264
viii. 22,	i. 63
viii. 32,	ii. 527
viii. 35-37,	ii. 395
viii. 37,	i. 396
viii. 38, 39,	i. 233, 395
ix. 6,	i. 336
ix. 6, 8,	i. 327
ix. 8,	i. 329
ix. 11, 12,	i. 133
ix. 14,	i. 63
ix. 16,	i. 170, 203
ix. 18,	i. 171
ix. 20, 21,	i. 171
x. 6-8,	i. 38
xi. 4,	i. 308
xi. 11, 12,	ii. 424
xi. 33,	i. 339 *bis*
xi. 36,	ii. 407
xii. 11,	i. 122
xii. 14,	ii. 523
xiii. 1, 2,	ii. 548
xiii. 14,	i. 81
xiv. 1,	i. 396
xiv. 9,	ii. 68, 466
xiv. 15,	i. 374, ii. 514
xiv. 21,	ii. 514
xv. 19,	ii. 444
xvi. 15,	ii. 6
xvi. 25, 26,	ii. 141

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 15,	i. 18
i. 18,	ii. 128
i. 21,	ii. 284
i. 23, 24,	i. 411
i. 24,	i. 18, 28
i. 26,	i. 247, ii. 352
i. 26-28,	i. 282
i. 27,	ii. 151, 467
i. 27, 28, 29,	ii. 340
i. 29,	i. 185
i. 30,	ii. 310, 385
ii. 2,	i. 348, ii. 69
ii. 2, 3,	i. 69
ii. 4, 5,	i. 467, ii. 337
ii. 6,	i. 225, ii. 31, 139
ii. 6, 7,	i. 301
ii. 6-8,	i. 237, 239, 304, ii. 100
ii. 7,	i. 237, ii. 140
ii. 9,	i. 267
ii. 10,	i. 36
ii. 11,	ii. 192
ii. 11, 12, 13,	i. 298
ii. 14,	ii. 414
iii. 6, 7,	i. 207
iii. 9,	ii. 161
iii. 12,	i. 146, ii. 173, 283, 413
iii. 13-15,	ii. 173
iii. 18, 19,	i. 410
iii. 19,	ii. 349, 446
iv. 11, 12,	ii. 469
iv. 12, 13,	ii. 333
v. 1,	i. 267
vi. 10,	ii. 523, 525
vi. 16,	ii. 13
vi. 17,	i. 108, ii. 389
vi. 20,	i. 374
vii. 18,	i. 321
vii. 31,	i. 58, 86
viii. 4, 11,	ii. 511
viii. 5,	ii. 495
viii. 5, 6,	ii. 189
viii. 8,	ii. 514
viii. 13,	ii. 514
ix. 8,	ii. 5
ix. 9,	i. 304
ix. 9, 10,	i. 305, ii. 216
ix. 26,	ii. 474
ix. 27,	ii. 320
x. 1, 2,	ii. 216
x. 3, 4,	ii. 216, 469
x. 4,	i. 306
x. 11,	i. 306, ii. 209
x. 13,	i. 227, 228, 229
x. 18,	i. 327
x. 23,	i. 117
x. 31,	ii. 518
xi. 3,	i. 106
xi. 19,	ii. 96
xii. 3,	i. 34, 40
xii. 4-7,	i. 41
xii. 6,	i. 42
xii. 8,	ii. 128
xii. 8, 9,	ii. 351
xii. 11,	ii. 41
xiii. 10,	ii. 359
xiii. 12,	ii. 359, 460, 473
xiv. 15,	i. 121
xv. 2,	ii. 346
xv. 3-8,	ii. 66
xv. 9,	i. 67
xv. 10,	i. 233
xv. 12,	ii. 94
xv. 22,	ii. 206, 375
xv. 25,	i. 54
xv. 25, 26,	ii. 374
xv. 28,	i. 260, 270
xv. 35-38,	ii. 286
xv. 39-42,	i. 138
xv. 40-42,	ii. 278
xv. 41,	i. 129, ii. 224
xv. 41, 42,	ii. 191
xv. 42,	i. 4
xv. 42, 43,	ii. 287

VOL. PAGE

xv. 44, . i. 137, ii. 224
xv. 48, 49, . ii. 287
xv. 49, . . ii. 287
xv. 50, . . ii. 287
xv. 51, 52, . ii. 285
xv. 52, . . ii. 69 *bis*
xv. 53, . . ii. 454
xv. 53-56, . i. 80
xv. 54, . . ii. 374

2 Corinthians.

i. 10, . . i. 56
ii. 4, . i. 116, 289
iii. 6, . i. 9, ii. 443
iii. 7, 8, . ii. 443
iii. 15, . . ii. 330
iii. 15-17, . i. 9
iv. 4, . . i. 355
iv. 6, . . ii. 341
iv. 10, . . ii. 460
iv. 18, . i. 89, 267, ii. 401
v. 1, . i. 89, ii. 454
v. 1-4, . . ii. 454
v. 6, 8, . . ii. 473
v. 10, . . i. 213
v. 13, . . i. 113
v. 16, . . ii. 461
v. 20, . . ii. 492
v. 21, . . ii. 175
vi. 16, . . ii. 506
viii. 16, . i. 230
ix. 9, 10, . i. 94
x. 3, . . ii. 334
x. 5, i. 230, ii. 161, 269
xi. 14, . . ii. 494
xi. 22, . . i. 94
xii. 2, . . ii. 450
xii. 4, . ii. 342, 465
xiii. 3, . i. 3, 112, 344
xiii. 4, . . i. 348

Galatians.

i. 4, . . ii. 396
i. 19, . . i. 447
ii. 5, . . ii. 445
ii. 12, . . ii. 2
ii. 20, . . i. 344
iii. 3, . . i. 35
iv. 10, 11, . ii. 509
iv. 21, 22, . ii. 5
iv. 21-24, . ii. 210
iv. 26, . . i. 329
v. 2, . . ii. 219
v. 8, . i. 171, ii. 399
v. 17, . i. 227, 245, 247, ii. 510
v. 19-21, . i. 247
v. 22, . . i. 35

VOL. PAGE

v. 25, . . ii. 475
vi. 14, . . ii. 72

Ephesians.

i. 4, . . i. 256
i. 21, . . i. 45
ii. 2, . i. 151, ii. 475
ii. 3, . . ii. 238
ii. 7, . . i. 85
ii. 20, . . ii. 507
iv. 10, . . i. 435
iv. 13, . . i. 56
iv. 14, . . ii. 286
iv. 27, . . i. 232
v. 1, . . ii. 406
v. 16, . . ii. 396
v. 31, 32, . ii. 216
vi. 2, 3, . i. 94, 324
vi. 11, . ii. 520, 540, 556
vi. 12, . i. 225, 232, ii. 520
vi. 13, . . i. 224

Philippians.

i. 23, . . i. 64, 149
ii. 5-9, . . ii. 178
ii. 6, 7, i. 348, ii. 175
ii. 6-8, . . ii. 353
ii. 10, 11, i. 29, ii. 543
ii. 13, . i. 170, 209
iii. 10, . . ii. 72
iii. 21, . . ii. 473
iv. 8, 9, . i. 101
iv. 13, . i. 233, ii. 554

Colossians.

i. 15, . i. 22, 95, 105, 355, ii. 407, 450
i. 16, . . i. 130
i. 16, 17, . i. 106
i. 16-18, . i. 59
ii. 8, . . i. 396
ii. 9, . . i. 110
ii. 15, . . ii. 67
ii. 16, . i. 307, ii. 510
ii. 18, 19, . ii. 275
iii. 3, . i. 112, 347
iii. 5, . ii. 320, 460
iii. 8, . . ii. 238
iii. 17, . . ii. 518
iv. 6, . ii. 114, 347

1 Thessalonians.

ii. 14-16, . i. 379
iv. 13-15, . ii. 69
iv. 15, 16, . ii. 285
iv. 16, . . ii. 69
iv. 16, 17, . ii. 285

VOL. PAGE

iv. 17, . . i. 151
v. 14, . . i. 325

2 Thessalonians.

ii. 1-12, . ii. 387
ii. 2, . . ii. 94
ii. 3, 4, . ii. 52, 385
ii. 4, . . ii. 388
ii. 6-10, . ii. 52
ii. 9, . . ii. 389
ii. 10-12, . ii. 52

1 Timothy.

i. 15, . . ii. 469
ii. 1, 2, . . ii. 556
ii. 5, . . ii. 384
ii. 20, 21, . ii. 236
iii. 16, . . ii. 112
iv. 1-3, . i. 116, ii. 334
iv. 4, 5, . ii. 518
iv. 10, . . ii. 188
vi. 17, 18, . ii. 444
vi. 20, 21, . ii. 94

2 Timothy.

i. 3, . i. 93, ii. 331
i. 16-18, . i. 212
ii. 5, . . ii. 541
ii. 10, . . ii. 141
ii. 11, . . ii. 72
ii. 15, . . ii. 268
ii. 20, . . i. 135
ii. 20, 21, . i. 214
ii. 21, . . i. 135
iii. 6, . . ii. 363
iii. 8, . . ii. 218
iv. 7, . . ii. 474

Titus.

i. 9, 10, . ii. 129
i. 12, . . ii. 124
iii. 3-6, . . i. 470
iii. 10, . . ii. 333

Hebrews.

i. 3, . i. 22, 24, 25, 343
i. 7, . . i. 122
i. 8, . . ii. 500
i. 14, . i. 45, 244, ii. 271, 520
ii. 1, . . i. 232
iii. 14, . . i. 390
iv. 12, . . i. 20
iv. 14, . . ii. 519
iv. 15, . . i. 110
v. 12-14, . ii. 134
v. 14, . . ii. 350
vi. 7, 8, . i. 177

	VOL. PAGE
viii. 5, .	i. 113, 271, 306, 307
ix. 26, . .	i. 85
x. 29, . .	ii. 499
xi. 24-26, .	i. 1
xi. 28, . .	i. 377
xi. 37, 38,	ii. 431, 441
xii. 22, . .	ii. 451
xii. 22, .	i. 330, ii. 495
xii. 29, . .	ii. 413
JAMES.	
iv. 17, . . .	i. 38
1 PETER.	
i. 9, . .	i. 121
ii. 5, . .	ii. 507
ii. 9, . .	ii. 277
ii. 22, . .	ii. 175
iii. 15, .	ii. 114, 435
iii. 18-21, .	i. 102
v. 6, . .	ii. 142
v. 8, . .	i. 244
1 JOHN.	
i. 5, . .	i. 449
i. 5,	i. 8, 343, ii. 278
ii. 1, 2, .	i. 117
ii. 2,	ii. 130, 188, 505
ii. 6, . .	i. 347
iii. 2, .	i. 263, ii. 190
v. 19, . .	i. 52, 86
REVELATION.	
i. 8, . .	i. 29
v. 8, . .	ii. 505
x. 4, . .	ii. 243
x. 9, . .	ii. 342
xiv. 6, . .	i. 339
xxi., . .	ii. 262

II.—INDEX OF PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS.

ABARIS, the Hyperborean, ii. 112.

Abraham, i. 419; and Isaac and Jacob, the names of, united with that of God, potent against demons, ii. 195-197.

Abstinence, the, practised by the Pythagoreans and Christians, the different reasons for, ii. 320.

Acts of Paul, The, quoted, i. 20.

Adam, not the name of an individual but of the whole race, ii. 206.

Ader [Hadad], i. 389.

Adrian and Jesus, ii. 117, 118.

Adultery, reasons why the followers of Zeno and Epicurus abstain from, ii. 484.

Advents of Christ, two, predicted, i. 459.

Æsculapius and his supposed heavenly power, ii. 102, 103, 104.

Africanus, the letter of, to Origen, i. 369, 370; reply of Origen to, 371, etc.

Ages, the, i. 85.

Allegories in Scripture, ii. 209, 210; Celsus accuses Christians of having recourse to, when ashamed of Scripture histories, 214; Celsus' objection to, refuted, 215-217.

Altar, the only, recognised by Christians, ii. 505.

Altars, images, and temples, why Christians reject and abhor, ii. 480-487.

Ammon forbids the use of cows' flesh, ii. 306.

Anaxarchus, anecdote of, ii. 475, 476.

Angel, the, who had power to hurt the uncircumcised, ii. 318, 319.

Angels, doctrine of the Church respecting, i. 7; how referred to by Paul, 45; a particular office assigned to each, 65; diversities among, the result of merit, 66; capable of good or evil, 67, 69; the substance of, 122, 123; superior to men, ii. 189, 190; employment and dignity of, 271, 519, 520; not to be worshipped or invoked, 272; that waited on Jesus, 327, 328.

Angels, evil, ii. 517.

Animal man, the, i. 120, 121.

Animals, irrational, the superiority of man to, ii. 244-256; power of sorcery attributed to, by Celsus, 252; knowledge of God attributed to, by Celsus, 254-256; division of, by Moses, into clean and unclean, 260; according to Celsus, nearer to God and more beloved by Him than men, 263, 264.

Annihilation of material substances not possible, i. 58.

Anthropopathy, the, of Scripture, ii. 236, 239.

Antichrist, ii. 385-388.

Antinous, ii. 117, 118, 119.

Ἀντίχθονες, i. 86.

Ants and bees asserted by Celsus to be not inferior in intelligence to man, ii. 246-248.

Apollonius of Tyana, ii. 380.

Apopompæus, i. 223.

Apostles, the subjects of their preaching, i. 3, etc.

Archilochus, the poet, ii. 105.

Aristeas of Proconnesus, the story

of, ii. 106-108; and Jesus, 108-111.
Aristotle flees from persecution, i. 471.
Ark, the, of Noah, ii. 207.
Artaxerxes and Mordecai, i. 231.
Ascension of Moses, The, quoted, i. 222.
Ἀσώματον, i. 5.
Augury, ii. 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257; demons the real source of, 259-261; forbidden by Moses, 262.
Avenging injuries, ii. 479, 480.

Babel, the overthrow of the tower of, ii. 180, 181.
Barnabas, The Epistle of, quoted respecting the two ways, i. 231; respecting the disciples of Jesus, 468.
Bees and ants asserted by Celsus to be not inferior to man in intelligence, ii. 246-256.
Betrayal, the, of Jesus by Judas, ii. 15, etc., 17, etc.
Bethlehem, Jesus born in, i. 453.
Birds, divination or augury by, ii. 254, 255, etc., 258, 259.
Birth, the influence of, i. 427.
Blessedness, the future, of the saints, not carnal, i. 145, 146; but spiritual, 147-153.
Bodily nature, the perpetuity of the, i. 77-79.
Body, the, can rational creatures live without? i. 80, 82; to be made immortal and incorruptible, the resurrection of, 137, ii. 284-292; varieties in the resurrection body, i. 138; a word to weak believers respecting the resurrection body, 139, etc.; as well as the soul, the work of God, Celsus refuted, ii. 220-224, 225, 226; Celsus misrepresents the views of Christians respecting, 533, 534; the care of, assigned by the Egyptians to thirty-six demons, 542, 543.
Breath of the power of God, the, i. 26-28.
Brightness of the Father's glory, Christ the, i. 24.

Calimachus, his hymn to Jupiter quoted, ii. 124, 125.
Callatians, a horrid custom of, ii. 307.
Camel, easier for a, to go through the eye of a needle, etc., ii. 354, 355.
Chæremon, his *Treatise on Comets* cited, i. 462.
Christ, the words of, i. 1; apostolical doctrine respecting, 3; the only-begotten Son of God, 18; the wisdom of God, 18, 19, 20; the eternal generation of, 19, 22; generated by the divine will, 23; the image of the invisible God, 23, 24; the brightness of the glory of God, 24, 25; the figure of God's person or subsistence, 25; the breath of the power of God, 26; the efflux of God's glory, 28; the splendour of eternal light, 30; the stainless mirror of God's ἐνέργεια, 31; the image of God's goodness, 31, 32; the incarnation of, 106; His union with God, 108; His union with God the reward of His love, 109; possessed a human and rational soul, 110, 111; anointed with the oil of joy, 111, 112; and Moses, as lawgivers, 275, etc.; predicted, 279, etc., 285, etc.; all the majesty of His divinity not confined within the limits of the body of, 345-347; Jacob's prophecy of, 454; sufferings of, predicted, 456; two advents of, predicted, 459, etc.; the belief of Jews and Christians in the advent of, Celsus answered, ii. 180. *See* Jesus.
Christianity, the power of, i. 277, etc., 424, 425, 426; its own defence, 393, 395; its real evidence, 399, 400; general conspiracy against, 400; not a secret system, 403; martyrs for, praised by Celsus, 404; adaptability of, to all orders of mind, ii. 464; the object of, to make all men wise, 126, 127, 128, 152; Celsus' slanders of the teachers of, refuted, 153, 154, 155, 156.
Christians, the, accused of entering into secret associations, i. 398, 399; hostility of the heathen to, 400; the morals of, 400, 401; regulations of, relating to idolatry, 401, 402; use no incantations in casting out demons, 402, 403; do not believe without a reason, 405; reformed by the power of their religion, 406; the points of difference between the Jews and, not trifling, ii. 85, 86, 88; not rebels against the Jewish State, 90, 91; the zeal of, to diffuse their principles, 92; few at first, yet not very few, 93; differences of opinion among, from the first, 94; existence of heresies among, no reproach to, 94-96; the basis of the union of, 96, 97; charged with inventing terrors, 98; the religion of, compared by Celsus with that of the Egyptians, 98, 99; charged by

Celsus with inviting to their ranks the ignorant only, 125-131; further calumnies of Celsus against, 131, 133; their mode of admitting members, 132; instructions given by, graduated to the capacity of the hearers, 133; desire to instruct all classes of men, 134; Celsus' calumnies respecting the way their teachers deal with the young and ignorant, 135-138; the worst invited by, to do them good, 139, 140, 141; slander of Celsus, that wise men are driven from the religion of, 151; charged with seeking after the unintelligent, 152; other charges against the teachers of, repelled, 153-156; not won by vain hopes, 158; Celsus' ridicule of, as bats and ants, etc., 183, 184; the acknowledged opinions of, which make them noble, 185, 186; the character of, 187, 188; do not profess to monopolize God, 188, 189; the argument between the Jews and, 329; sects and heresies among, 331, 333, 335; old calumnies against, 365, 366; Celsus confounds them with certain silly errorists, 365, etc.; Celsus reviles—answer to Celsus' revilings of, 373-376; their views of God misrepresented by Celsus, 449-450; their hope after death, 450-451; further calumnies of Celsus, 462; instructed and stigmatized by Celsus, 468, 469; how they live, 471; why they reject images, temples, and altars, 483-487; not inconsistent in their rejection of images, 487; use no barbarous words in prayer, 522; do not revile the statues of the gods, 523, 524, 525; the loving zeal of, for the salvation of men, 536; the liberty of, 538, 539, 540; urged by Celsus to help the king and fight for him—how they do this, 556-558; why they refuse to take office under government, 558.

Christs, false, 460, 461.

Chrysippus' treatise *On the Cure of the Passions* quoted, i. 470; *On the Subjugation of the Passions*, ii. 535.

Churches of the Christians, and heathen assemblies, compared and contrasted, ii. 110, 112.

Circumcision, i. 419; as practised by the Jews different from that practised by the Gentiles, ii. 316, 318; of Moses' son, 318, 319; abolished by Christ, 319.

Clean and unclean animals, the reason of the Mosaic division into, ii. 260.

Clement of Rome quoted, i. 86, 87.

Cleomedes, the boxer, of Astypalea, ii. 105, 114.

Clothing, the, of the soul and of the body, i. 81.

Condescension, the, of God, ii. 172, 174, 175.

Conflagration, the, of the world, Celsus' cavils against, ii. 281-285.

Conflict, the, with the powers of evil, i. 232, etc.

Confusion of tongues, the, at Babel, ii. 297-299.

Consummation, the, i. 53-59.

Controversy between Jason and Papiscus, The, concerning Christ, referred to, 218, 219.

Conversion possible for the very worst, ii. 145-148.

Converts from Judaism do not desert the law of their fathers, ii. 1, 2.

Corporeal and incorporeal being, i. 59-65.

Corporeity, will it ever be destroyed? i. 82, 83, etc.

Corruptible, the, putting on incorruption, i. 80, 81.

Cosmogony, the Mosaic, the criticism of Celsus on, answered, ii. 390-392, 402, 403.

Cows' flesh forbidden by Ammon, ii. 306.

Creation, the, of the world in time, i. 253, etc.; objection to the creation of the world in time answered, 255; the peculiar term employed in Scripture to express, 258.

Creation of man, the, ridiculed by Celsus, ii. 199, 200; and of beast, the work of God, 220-224.

Creature, the, subjected to vanity, i. 63-65, 257, 258.

Creatures, made by God in the beginning, i. 126; changeable and mutable, 128; varieties of, 129, 130.

Crocodiles, Celsus has no fault to find with the worshippers of, ii. 310.

Cup, the prayer of Jesus respecting the, ii. 32.

Customs, ought those of our respective countries to be followed? ii. 305, etc.; the variety and absurdity of, 306, etc.

Cycles of mortal things, asserted by Celsus, refutation of the notion of,

ii. 232, 233; taught by the Stoics, 389, 390.

Dan and Bethel, i. 390.
Daniel, the wisdom of, ii. 127.
Daniel, additions to the book of, in the LXX., i. 371, 372, 373.
Darkness, outer, i. 144.
Darkness, the rulers and powers of, obtained their degrees of evil by their own conduct, i. 69.
Darkness, the, round about God, ii. 355.
Days, sacred, ii. 509, 510.
Death, how could the Jews in captivity pass the sentence of? i. 385.
Death, the hope of Christians after, ii. 450, 451.
Death, the last enemy, destroyed, i. 268, 269.
Defection, the, of men, i. 43.
Deluge, the, the cavils of Celsus respecting, ii. 206-208, 401.
Demons, *formulæ* used against, ii. 195, 196, 197; the source of augury by birds, etc., 259, 260, 261; the seven ruling, referred to by Celsus, 368, 369; cast out by Christians, 487; the worship of, inconsistent with the worship of God, 488-490; eating things offered to, 514-517; have nothing to do with food and drink, 516-518; first-fruits not to be offered to, 519; can inflict no injury on Christians, 521, 522; Jesus not a demon, 524; afraid of martyrs, 528; not set over the fruits of the earth, 542; thirty-six, among the Egyptians, have assigned to them the care of the human body, 542; caution, according to Celsus, required in the service of, 544-546; other references to, 110, 113, 114, 115, 117, 194, 232, 259, 260, 261, 264, 272, 512, 544.
Desire of knowledge, the, to be satisfied in a future state, i. 146-151.
Deuteronomy, the book of, i. 338, 339.
Devil, the, and his angels, the doctrine of the Church respecting, i. 5; the titles of, 45; not incapable of goodness, 68; the agency of, as set forth in the Old Testament, 222; as revealed in the New Testament, 224; not the prompter to all sins, 227-229; how he and his allied powers tempt, 229; the contest against, 232, etc.; the charges of Celsus against the Christians in relation to, refuted, ii. 380-384; the fall of, 385.
Diagram, a curious, referred to by Celsus as in use among certain heretics, ii. 362, 363, 368, 369, 376, 377.
Disciples, the, of Jesus, their devotion to their Master, i. 430; defended against Celsus, 466-470; justified in fleeing from persecution, 471; truthfulness of, ii. 21, 23.
Dionysius, ii. 103.
Dioscuri, the, and Hercules, and Æsculapius, no gods, ii. 102, 103.
Divination, ii. 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259.
Doctrine of Peter, The, the apocryphal work so called, quoted, i. 6.
Dositheans, the, ii. 349.
Dove, the descent of a, on Jesus, i. 440, 441, 442-446.

Earth, the distribution of the several parts of, among superintending spirits, according to Celsus, ii. 293, etc.; the correct view respecting, 296, 297.
Ebionite, meaning of the name, i. 329.
Ebionites, who so called, ii. 1.
Efflux of the glory of God, Christ the, i. 28.
Egypt, how the Hebrews were delivered from, ii. 89, 90.
Egyptians, the, what the Israelites did with the spoil of, i. 388, 389; the Jews not descended from, ii. 88-90; the religion of, foolishly compared by Celsus to that of the Christians, 98, 99; inconsistently lauded by Celsus, 423; assign the care of the human body to thirty-six demons, 542, 543.
Elephants, the fidelity of, to oaths, according to Celsus, ii. 265.
End, the, when it will come, i. 54; and the beginning, 55; what shall be after, 58; admonitory remarks respecting, 262-273.
Enemy, the last, destroyed, i. 268, 269.
Enoch, The book of, quoted, i. 352, ii. 325.
Epictetus, an anecdote of, ii. 475, 476.
Epicureans, reasons of the, for abstaining from adultery, ii. 484.
Eros, the story of, from the *Symposium* of Plato, ii. 203-205.
Esaias sawn asunder, i. 377, 378.
Esoteric and exoteric doctrines of Christianity, the, i. 403.
Eternal generation of Christ, the, i. 19, 23.
Etymological fancies in Scripture, i. 383.

Euphrates, ii. 367.
Euripides quoted, ii. 243.
Eve, the formation of, ridiculed by Celsus, ii. 201.
Evidences of the truth of Christianity, i. 445, 446.
Evil, or good, every rational created nature capable of, i. 68; God, not the author of, 395-398; what sort of, God may be said to cause, 398; the final complete destruction of, 555.
Evil beings, made such by themselves in their respective degrees, i. 69.
Evils, never more nor fewer, according to Celsus—refutation of this opinion, ii. 228, 229, 230; the inquiry into the origin of, difficult, 231, 232; the source of, 232; seeming, 235, 236; allowed for good ends, 398.
Eyes, open and shut,—the inner and outer, ii. 461.

Faith, the reforming power of the Christian, i. 406; the call to, rational, 407.
Faith in Jesus, ii. 120.
Fallen spirits, i. 57; the restoration of, 57, 58.
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a summary of the doctrine of the, i. 342, etc.
Figure of the Father's person, Christ the, i. 25.
Fire, eternal, the threatening of, i. 40-43.
Fire, God a consuming, i. 9; why God is represented as, ii. 172, 173.
Flesh and spirit, i. 245-248.
Floods and conflagrations, ii. 171.
Food, spiritual, i. 147; different ways of preparing, i. 480, 481.
Foolishness, the kind recommended by Christianity, i. 410.
Foreknowledge, does not necessitate the events foreseen, ii. 25, 26, 27, 28; the gift of, does not necessarily imply virtue, 105; no proof of divinity, 262, 263.
Foundation of the world, the, i. 256.
Free-will, i. 4, 132, 133; fully asserted, 157, etc.; able to resist external causes, 161; proved from Scripture, 165, etc.; passages of Scripture apparently opposed to, explained, 168-221.

Gehenna, ii. 263, 264.
Generation, eternal, the, of Christ, i. 19, 22, 23.
Glory, human, forbidden, ii. 447.
God, apostolic doctrine respecting, i. 3; a Spirit, 8-11; light, *ibid.*; fire, 9; incomprehensible, 11; revealed in His works, 12, 13; simple and uncompounded in His nature, 12, 15; the nature of, surpasses natural bodies, 15, 16; invisible,—how said to be seen, 16, 17; the image of, 23, 24, 262, 263; omnipotent, 28, 301, ii. 149; nature of His power, 31; created all things, i. 34; the, of the law and the prophets the same as the Father of Jesus Christ, 91, etc.; not a body, 91; anthropopathic expressions respecting, in the Old Testament, explained, 96, 97; the justice and goodness of, 97-105; the soul of, 125, 126; nothing happens without the permission of, 235; what was He doing before He created the world? 256; in the end, all in all, 264, 265; one, believed in by the Jews, 420, 421; His dealing with the good and the bad, ii. 149, 150; His descent upon earth objected to by Celsus,—meaning of His descent, 162-166, 172; by descending on earth He does not vacate heaven, 166; why He desires to make Himself known to men, 167, 168; in every age has passed into the souls of men, 168; has revealed Himself to some pre-eminently, 169; Celsus accuses Christians of babbling about, 171; a consuming fire, 172, 173; the condescension of, 172, 173, 174, 175; further objections of Celsus to the descent of, to earth, answered—object of the incarnation of, 177, 178; figurative language used to describe, 200, 404; the one Creator of body and soul, man and beast, 220-224; anger, wrath, etc., ascribed to—how this is to be understood, 237-239; made all things for the sake of man, 239, 240, 241, 242; ever near His people, 280; the name given to, is not unimportant, but the contrary, 315-317; darkness round about, 355; those who call Him "accursed," 365, 366, 367; in what sense said to make evil, 395, 397; not incapable of persuading men, 398, 399; in what sense said to repent, 399, 400; the resting attributed to, 403; man made in the image of, 405, 406; can He be reached by a word? 408; how to

know, 408, 409, 410, 411; the Spirit of, 413, 414; Celsus misrepresents the views of Christians respecting, 449, 450; how seen, 455; not confined to place, 456; not known by the senses, 457, etc.; hard to find out, 464, 465; adapts His truth to all classes, 464; seen in Christ, 465, 466; known by the simplest Christian, through the help of divine grace, 466, 467; the worship of Christ consistent with the sole worship of, 500, 501; worshipped equally well in different languages, 522.
Gods, Scythian and Greek, ii. 377, 378; many, not to be served, 492, etc., 496-500; Christians do not revile the statues of the, 523.
Goodness, divine, i. 32; and justice, 97, etc.; consistent with the infliction of punishment, 98, etc.
Gospel, the, not perverted by Christians, ii. 33.
Gospels, the, not all pure history, i. 315, 317, 320; their character and authors, ii. 121.
Greek philosophy and learning to be made subservient to Christianity, i. 388.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, letter of Origen to, i. 388.

Hardening, the, of Pharaoh's heart, i. 169, etc., 176-191.
Healing art, the possession of the, does not necessarily imply virtue, ii. 105.
Heaven, i. 88, 89, 90, 152.
Heavenly bodies, the, animated and endowed with souls, i. 59-65.
Heavenly Dialogue, A, quoted by Celsus, ii. 503.
Heavens, the, opened to Jesus at His baptism, i. 448, 449, 450; not called God, nor worshipped by the Jews, ii. 275-279.
Hebrew Master, the, of Origen, cited, i. 35.
Hebrews, the, not Egyptians by descent,—how freed from Egyptian bondage, ii. 88-92.
Hercules, proposed by Celsus to Christians as an object of homage, —the character of, ii. 475, 476.
Heresies among Christians no reproach, ii. 96-98, 331-333, 335.
Hermas, The Shepherd of, quoted, i. 34, 35, 230, 301.
Herod seeks to destroy the child Jesus, i. 464, 465.
Heroes proposed by Celsus to the Christians as objects of homage superior to their own, ii. 475.
Hesiod quoted as to the formation of Pandora, ii. 201, 202.
Holy Spirit, the, the apostolic doctrine of, i. 3; what, 10; the existence of, 33; what we are taught in Scripture respecting, 34; not created, 35; one of the two seraphim of Isaiah, *ibid.*; reveals God, 36; the nature of His working as distinguished from that of the Father and the Son, 37-40, 41, 43; taken from the unworthy, 39; dwells in the renewed, 39, 40; bestowed on the saints, 40; one, 114; every rational creature receives a share of, 114, 115; the advent of, after the ascension of Christ, 115; gifts of, 116; the Paraclete, 116, 117.
Homer quoted respecting the sparrow, serpent, and eagle, ii. 258.
Hope, the, of Christians after death, ii. 450, 451.
Human nature, the dignity of, ii. 183-186.
Humility, ii. 352, 353.

Idol festivals, why not take part in? ii. 511, 512.
Idolatry, even heathen philosophers condemn, i. 401.
Idols, abstinence from meats offered to, ii. 514, 515, 516.
Ignorance receives no sanction from Christianity, ii. 125-131, 154.
Image of God, the, man made in, i. 262-264, ii. 405, 487.
Image of God's goodness, the, i. 32.
Image of the invisible God, Christ the, i. 23, 24.
Images, not gods, ii. 121; the making of, forbidden to the Jews, 193; why Christians reject, 480-487; the true, of God, 505, 506.
Immortality, the, of rational natures, i. 353.
Incantations, not used by Christians, i. 402, 403; the power of names in, ii. 315, 316.
Incarnation, the, of Christ, i. 105; the wonderfulness of, 106, 107; the intermediacy of Christ's soul between the flesh and God in, 108, 109; the assumption of the soul in, a reward of that soul's virtues, 109; difficulty as to Christ's possessing a

human soul, removed, 110; the subject illustrated, 111, 112; implies no change in God, the object of, ii. 174, 175, 176-179; cavilled at and ridiculed by Celsus, 415, 416, 421, 422.
Incorporeal, meaning of the term, i. 5, 6.
Inspiration, the, of the Scriptures, i. 274, 285.
Instinct and reason, ii. 250-253.
Interpretation, of the promises, not literal, but spiritual, i. 143-148; of the Scriptures, the true method of, 291-323.
Isis and Osiris, ii. 309.
Israel, the carnal and spiritual, i. 327.

Jacob, and Esau, i. 133, 134; wrestles with an angel, 234; his prophecy of Christ, 455.
James, the brother of our Lord, i. 447.
Jesus, His conversation with the woman of Samaria, i. 11; silence of, before His judges, 393; charge of sorcery against, power of His name, 402, 403; acted by a divine power, 424, 425, 426; Celsus introduces a Jew disputing with, and refuting, 426, 427; Celsus' defamation of, turned into an argument to enhance the glory and divine power of, 427, 430; the attachment of His disciples to, and His death for men, 430, 431; the miraculous birth of, vindicated against Celsus, 431, 432; predicted to be born of a virgin, 433; no rational objection to the birth of, from a virgin, 437; absurdity of imputing the miracles of, to magic, 438, 439; descent of a dove on, 440, 441, 442, 443; no grounds for believing in Moses while He is rejected, 444, 445; evidence of the divinity of the doctrine of, 445, 446; the heavens open to, 448, 449, 450; prophecies relating to, 451, 452, etc.; born in Bethlehem, 453; the disciples of, Celsus' account of them, 466-470; flight of, into Egypt, justified against Celsus, 472, 473; the miracles of, defended, 474; the miracles of, not wrought by magic, 474-476; Celsus' silly carping about the body of, exposed, 476, 477; His promise of the Spirit of truth, ii. 3; observed the Jewish law, 7, 8; not arrogant, but meek and lowly, 8; inconsistency of the Jews in rejecting, 9, 10; Celsus' impeachment of the Godhead of, answered, 10, 11; never broke His promise, 13; never attempted disgracefully to hide from His enemies, 14; the betrayal of, 15; the argument of Celsus founded on the betrayal of, answered, 17, etc.; predictions respecting,—Celsus' mode of dealing with the predictions respecting, refuted, 18, 21; the disciples of, lovers of truth, 21; really suffered, died, and was raised from the dead,—an objection met, 22-24; if He foreknew the traitor and perjurer, why did they not desist from their purpose? 24, 25; His foreknowledge did not compel the events foreknown, 25-28; His suffering real, and voluntarily and submissively endured, 29-33; predictions concerning the life of, 34, 35; the union of kingdoms at the time of the birth of, 35, 36; objection of Celsus drawn from the genealogies of, 37; 'what great deeds did He perform, being a God?' answered, 37, 38; could He not have delivered Himself from His enemies?—punishment of the enemies of, 38, 39, 40; blood and water flow from the side of,—Celsus' mockery of this, 40; vinegar and gall given to, 41; objection of Celsus that He gained over no one in His life,—why the Jews are blamed for not believing in, 42-45; Celsus' assertion that He did not show Himself pure from evil, 43, 44; numbered with transgressors, 45, 46; conduct of the disciples on His being apprehended, — Celsus' argument founded on this refuted, 47; Celsus' assertion that He only gained over ten sailors and taxgatherers, 47, 48; why Christians were won over to, 48, 49; refutation of Celsus concerning the miracles of, 49-57; and the heroes of heathenism compared, 59, 60; the resurrection of, 60; ought He to have appeared after His resurrection to His persecutors? 65-70; why did He not escape from the cross? 71, 72; to whom He appeared after His resurrection, 74; purposes of His mission, 75; Celsus' argument derived from the incredulity of the Jews, answered, 77-81; censured by Celsus for using threats, 79, etc.;

unbelief of the Jews as to, predicted and punished, 82, 83; the power of, to diffuse His doctrine and convert men, 83, 84; not to be compared with Æsculapius, Hercules, etc., 102, 103; nor with Aristeas of Proconnesus — advantages derived from, 106-111; nor with Abaris the Hyperborean, 112; nor with the Clazomenean, 113; nor with Cleomedes of Astypalea, 114; nor with Zamolxis, 115, 116; nor with Adrian, 117, 118; nor with Antinous, 119, 120; the human nature of, changed into God, 122, 123; and Cretan Jove, 124, 125; Celsus' objection that He was sent to sinners, 141, 142, 143; suffering of the Jews for their crime against, 182, 526, 527; cavils of Celsus respecting — not the only one sent from God to men, 321, 322; angels wait on—reply to Celsus on this point, 327, 328; the soul of, joined to the Word, 389, 390; personal appearance of—Celsus' reproaches respecting this, 418-420; appearances after His resurrection not shadowy, 456; conduct of, under His sufferings, 476, 477; death of, 478; the worship of, consistent with the worship of the one God, 500, 501; the Son of God, 501, 502; not a demon, 523, 524; fruitfulness of the death of, 527.

Jews, the, mutilated the Scriptures of the Old Testament, i. 377, 379; Celsus casts a slight upon, 411, 412; Numenius and others speak favourably of, 412, 413; the antiquity of, 413; believe in one God, 420, 421; falsely accused by Celsus of angel-worship and sorcery, 424; the inconsistency of, in rejecting Jesus,—their unbelief foretold, ii. 9, 10, 77, 82, 83; punishment of their unbelief, 10; what they are to be blamed for respecting Jesus, 41; the points of difference between Christians and, not foolish, 85, 86, 88; how they adhere to their religion, 87, 88; blunder of Celsus as to the Egyptian descent of, 88, 89; the punishment of, for their treatment of Jesus, 182; Celsus' ridicule of Christians and, 183; vindicated against Celsus, the law and polity of, 192, 193; the genealogy of, 195, 197, 198; do not worship the heavens, 272, 273; do not consider the heavens to be God, 274; do not bow down to angels, 276, 277, 278; defended against the false charges of Celsus, 312, 313; have nothing in common with the Persians in the worship of God, 314; the circumcision practised by, different from that of other nations, 317, 318; reason of their abstinence from swine's flesh, 319, 320; were highly favoured by God, 320, 321, 530, 531.

Job, additions to the book of, in the LXX., i. 378; and in the Hebrew text, *ibid.*

John the Baptist referred to by Josephus, i. 447.

Jonah and Jesus, ii. 478.

Joseph, Celsus' cavils respecting, ii. 213.

Judaism, converts from, do not desert the law of their fathers, ii. 1, 5, 6.

Judas, the conduct of, in betraying, and after betraying, Jesus, ii. 15, 16; foretold, 27.

Judea and Jerusalem, figures of a heavenly land, ii. 451.

Jupiter, the Cretan, ii. 124, 125.

Just man, the, promised riches, ii. 444; how he slays and prevails, 445.

Justice and goodness, their harmony and consistency, i. 97-105.

Καταβολή, i. 256, 258.

Kings, the favour of, according to Celsus, to be sought, ii. 547, 548; swearing by the fortune of, 549; how Christians fight for and help, 556, 557.

Knowledge, the increase of, in the future state, i. 148-151.

Κόσμος, i. 86.

Labour, the wisdom of the necessity of, laid on man, ii. 242.

Laius, and the oracle given to, ii. 26, 27.

Land, the good, promised by God to the righteous, ii. 450, 451, 452.

Languages, the confusion of, at Babel, ii. 297, 298, 299.

Law, is it the king of all things? ii. 310, 311.

Law of Moses, the, the irrationality and impossibility of some of its precepts taken literally, i. 317-320; twofold, ii. 443, 444; promises riches to the just, 444.

Laws, ancestral, is it impiety to aban-

don them? ii. 293-298; when those of states and natural, are opposed, which to be followed? 307, 308.
Light, the, not to be worshipped, ii. 278, 279; and darkness, 409, 410.
Light, God is, i. 8, 31.
Lot and his daughters, the story of, assailed by Celsus,—explanation of, ii. 211, 212.
Lucifer, his fall from heaven, i. 51-53.

Magi, the visit of the, to Jesus, i. 461, 464.
Magic, the miracles of Jesus not wrought by, i. 474-476; over whom it has power, ii. 379, 380.
Man, the account of the creation of, ridiculed by Celsus, ii. 199, 200; all things made for the sake of, 239, 240-244; superiority of, over irrational animals, 244-256.
Marcion, ii. 324, 417.
Martyrs, demons afraid of, ii. 528.
Masters, no man can serve two, ii. 493.
Meats and drinks, abstaining from, ii. 514, 515, 516.
Mediator, the, through whom we come to God, ii. 271, 272.
Men, not be compared to bats and worms, as Celsus compares them,—the dignity of their nature, ii. 182-185; God's care over the first, 246.
Minerva, ii. 550.
Miracles of Jesus, the, their greatness, i. 474; not wrought by magic, 474-476; vindicated against Celsus, ii. 49-57.
Miraculous appearances, on Greek testimony, witnessed by men, ii. 326, 327.
Mithrus, the mysteries of, referred to by Celsus, ii. 260, 262.
Moses, his history assailed by Celsus, i. 414, 415; a challenge on behalf of the laws of, 415, 416; Celsus strives to discredit his account of creation, 416; a divine spirit in, 417; excellency of the history transmitted by, 418; no reason for believing in, while rejecting Christ, 444, 445; and Jesus, the miracles of, ii. 54-57, 58, 59; the antiquity of, 171; his division of animals into clean and unclean, 260, 261; the cosmogony of, taken exception to by Celsus, 390-392, 402, 403.

Name of Jesus, the power of, i. 403.
Names, the origin, power, and mystery of, i. 421, 422, 423; not unimportant, ii. 315; the power of, in invocations, 316.
New heavens and new earth, the, i. 56, 58.
Numenius, his treatise on *The Good*, i. 412.

Old Testament, the, and the New, their teaching harmonious, ii. 444, etc., 447.
Only-begotten Son of God, Christ the, i. 18; the self-abasement of, 259.
Ophites, the, referred to, ii. 362, 365, 366, 367, 462.
Opposing powers, or powers of darkness, the, i. 222, etc.; our conflict with, 232, etc.
Oracles, ii. 426, 456; and responses, 529; and the words of the prophets, 530.
Orpheus, proposed by Celsus to Christians as an object of homage, ii. 275, 276.
Osiris and Isis, ii. 309.

Pandora, Hesiod's description of the formation of, ii. 201, 202.
Pappæus, ii. 315-317.
Parables, why Jesus spoke in, i. 195-202.
Paraclete, the, i. 114, 116.
Paradise, the, prepared for departed saints, i. 151.
Passions, the, which affect the soul, i. 141.
Pastor, The, of Hermas, quoted, i. 34, 35, 230, 301.
Paul, his desire to depart, i. 159, 160; his wisdom, ii. 100, 101.
Persecution, Jesus and His disciples justified in avoiding, i. 471.
Persians, and Jews hold nothing in common in the worship of God, ii. 214; mysteries of the, 360; have no temples, 483; worship the creature, 485, 486.
Peter, his superstitious adherence to Jewish observances,—how delivered from it, ii. 1-3.
Pharaoh, the hardening of the heart of, i. 171-191.
Philosophers, the folly and error of, ii. 470.
Phœnix, the, ii. 265.
Planets, the, i. 87.
Plato, quoted respecting Eros, ii. 203-205; and Scripture, the respective styles of, 336-338; the inefficacy of his teaching compared with that of the Scriptures, 339-341; Jesus

does not quote and pervert the words of, as Celsus asserts, 354; excelled by the Scriptures in his idea of God, 355, 366; quoted as to *Elysium*, 450; quoted as to certain precious stones, 452; his *Timæus* quoted, 464; on the avenging of injuries, 479.
Potter, the, his power over the clay, i. 211, etc.
Power of God, the, i. 26, 28.
Prayer, to whom it is to be made, ii. 272, 273; Christians use no barbarous names in, 522.
Precious stones, certain, spoken of by Plato, ii. 452.
Predictions, respecting India, Egypt, and Babylon, etc., 331, 332; respecting Jesus Christ. *See* Prophecies.
Pre-existence, the, of rational creatures, i. 256-258.
Prejudice, the power of, i. 455.
Principalities and powers of darkness, the, i. 68-70.
Prino-prisein and *Schino-schisein* difficulty of interpretation, the, i. 375, 381, 383.
Promises, the, of future good, not to be interpreted literally and carnally, i. 145-153.
Prophecies, the, the cavils of Celsus respecting, answered, ii. 431-440, 441, etc.; relating to Christ, 451, 453, etc.; 456-458, 459.
Prophets, the, the various ways God spake to, i. 380; quoted from each other, 386; necessary for the Jews, 436, 437; the character of, ii. 430, 431; power of the words of, 530.
Providence, divine, maintained against Celsus, ii. 240-244, 266; incorrect views of, rectified, 488, 489.
Ψυχή, i. 123.
Punishment, future, the Christian doctrine of, i. 140, etc., ii. 524, 532, 534, 535.
Pythagoreans, the abstinence practised by, ii. 320.
Pythian oracle, the, ii. 426, 429.

Qualities always belong to substances, i. 351.
Queen of Sheba, the, ii. 126.

Rational natures, various, i. 44, 45; capable of sin, 45; evil, 45, 46; whether any were created so as to be incapable of sin or of virtue, 46, 47; the glory of some and the wickedness of others not original and essential to their being, but the result of desert, 48, 69; never sink into the condition of irrational animals, 70; can they lead an existence out of the body, 82; the immortality of, 353, etc.
Repentance, attributed to God, ii. 399, 400.
Resting, predicated of God, ii. 403.
Restoration, the, of fallen beings, i. 56, 57.
Resurrection, the, of the body, i. 136; weak believers instructed on the subject, 139; ridiculed by Celsus, explained and defended, ii. 282, 285, 286-288, 454, 455.
Resurrection, the, of Jesus, ii. 59-62; the belief of, not the product of a dream, 63; why did not Jesus show Himself to His enemies after, 65-70; His appearances after, not phantom-like, 457.
Riches, promised to the just man, in what sense, ii. 444; Jesus gave no laws contrary to this promise of, 446.

Samaritan woman, Jesus converses with a, i. 11.
Satan, ii. 385; and Antichrist, 385, 386. *See* Devil.
Scriptures, the, the teaching of the Church respecting, i. 5; the inspiration of, 274, etc., 285, etc.; the superhuman element in, does not present itself to the uninstructed, 287-290; how to be regarded and understood, 291, 294, 299; a threefold sense in, 300; the soul of, 303-308; the mysteries contained in, 308, etc.; stumbling-blocks in, 212; the histories of, not all pure history, but some to be mystically understood, 313-322; in regard to many things, the historical and literal sense of, the true sense, 323; passages of, which are true in their historical sense, more numerous than those which are to be spiritually understood, 324; the need of careful search to distinguish between what is literal in, and what is not, 325; our duty to grasp the whole meaning of, 326; etymological fancies in, 383; exhortation to the study of, 390; many of the histories of, allegories, ii. 209, 210; simplicity of the style of, compared with that of Plato, 326-338; the inefficacy of the teaching of Plato

compared with that of, 339-341; exceed Plato in the idea they give of God, 355, 356.
Scythian and Greek names of God, ii. 377, 378.
Secret associations, Christians charged by Celsus with entering into,—reply, i. 390.
Sects among Christians, ii. 331-333, 335.
Seeing God, i. 16, 17, ii. 465, 466.
Sense and the senses, i. 15.
Septuagint, additions to the Scripture in the—defence of these additions, i. 371-373.
Seraphim, the, i. 35, 340, 341.
Serapis, ii. 309.
Seriphian and Themistocles, i. 428.
Serpent, the, Celsus ridicules the story of the temptation by, ii. 203; is the devil, 483.
Shepherd of Hermas, The, i. 34, 35, 230, 301.
Sicarians, the, ii. 19.
Silence, the, of Jesus before His judges, i. 393.
Simonians, the, ii. 332, 348.
Sin, incentives to, ii. 226.
Sinners, Christianity invites and restores to virtue, ii. 139-144; a change of life possible for, asserted against Celsus, 145-149.
Sneezing, according to the poets, prophetic, ii. 261.
Socrates pronounced the wisest of men, ii. 429.
Son, the only-begotten, of God, Christ the, i. 18; self-abasement of, 257; subjection of, to the Father, 260-262; the generation of, 342, 343; the advent and incarnation of, 345-347; the dignity of, ii. 308, 388, 389, 502; the soul of Jesus joined with, 389, 390; Celsus misrepresents the views of Christians respecting, 503.
"Sons of God" and "daughters of men," ii. 325.
Sorcery, Jesus charged with, by Celsus, i. 402, 403; the Jews charged with, 424; the miracles of Jesus not wrought by, ii. 49-56; the power of, attributed by Celsus to certain animals, 252, etc.
Soul, the, apostolic teaching respecting, i. 4; a lost, 121, 122; meaning of the word, 123, 124; and spirit of Christ, 125; why acted on sometimes by evil spirits and sometimes by good, 242, etc.; and body alike the work of God, ii. 220-226.
Souls, various sorts of, 118, 119; of angels and of God, 119, 120; has man two?—three theories discussed, 244-252; good and bad, ii. 428.
Spirit,—what? i. 9.
Spirit of truth, the, promised by Jesus, ii. 3, 4; perpetually bestowed, 412, 413.
Spirits, wicked, their mode of operation, i. 241; good, their agency, 242.
Spiritual body, the, i. 266, 267.
Splendour of the eternal light, Christ the, i. 30.
Spoiling the Egyptians, i. 388, 389.
Star, the, of the wise men, i. 462, 464.
Stars, living rational beings capable of sin, i. 61, 62.
Stony heart, the, how taken away, i. 191, etc.
Stumbling-blocks designedly placed in the Scriptures, i. 312.
Subjection, the, of the Son to the Father, i. 260, etc.
Substance, i. 350.
Suffering of Christ, the, predicted, i. 456, 457.
Sun, the, and other planets endowed with life and souls, i. 59-65.
Superiority and inferiority, not to be decided by a bodily standard, ii. 184.
Susanna, the story of, inquiry of Africanus respecting the genuineness of, i. 369, 370; Origen's defence of the genuineness of, 371, etc.
Swine's flesh, abstinence from, ii. 319, 320.

Temple, the true, of God, ii. 506, 507.
Temptations, proportioned to the strength of the tempted, ii. 227-229; human, treated of at large, 244, etc.
"Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth," ii. 57.
Thomas, the scepticism of, ii. 64, 65.
Thoughts, how suggested, i. 229, 230.
Threefold sense of Scripture, the, i. 300, etc.
Thrones, dominions, etc., i. 56.
Tobias, i. 384.
Trinity, the, the unity and operations of the persons of, i. 37-41; the sum of the doctrine of, 342, etc.
Truth is truth, by whomsoever spoken, ii. 480; how served up as food by philosophers and prophets and the disciples of Christ, 480, 481.
Typical interpretation, i. 306.

Tyre, the prince of, i. 49-51.

Union among Christians, the basis of, ii. 96, etc.
Unity of opinion, not characteristic of Christians from the beginning, ii. 94.

Vanity, the creature made subject to, i. 63-65, 257, 258.
Variety, the, of creatures in the world, i. 128; accordance of this with righteousness and reason, 131, etc.; brought to pass by the free-will of individuals, 132-136.
Veil on the heart, the, i. 9.
Vessels to honour and to dishonour, i. 213.
Vinegar and gall, the, predicted, ii. 41.
Virgin Mother, the, vilified by Celsus, vindication of, i. 426, 427, 431, 433; prediction of the birth of Christ of, 434, 435; the birth of Jesus of, open to no fair objection, 437, 438.

Will, the free, i. 4, 132, 133, 157, etc.; able to resist external causes, 161; its freedom proved from Scripture, 165.
Wisdom, threefold, i. 237; of the world, 238; of the princes of the world, 239; the sort condemned by Christianity, 410; of Christianity, 100, 101; Christianity designed to impart, 126, etc.; human and divine, 350, 351, 352.
Wisdom of God, Christ the, i. 19, 20, 26, 28.
"Wood, hay, stubble," ii. 173.
Word, the incarnation of the, ii. 174, 175; different appearances of the, 176; final universal victory of the, 555.
Words, not to be specially considered by searchers after truth, but the meaning of, i. 339, 341.
Words of Christ, the, i. 1.
World, the, the doctrine of the Church respecting, i. 5; the great variety in, 72; cause of the variety in, 72, 73; the unity of, in diversity, 73, 74; the oneness of, proved from Scripture, 75; the matter of, and its transformations and qualities, 75; the matter of, not uncreated, 76, 77; the beginning of,—was there one before, and shall there be one after? 79; this, the conclusion of many ages, 85; different meanings of the word in Scripture, 86; another besides this, 86, 87, etc.; comprehensiveness of, and variety of creatures in, 128-130; the accordance of this variety in, with righteousness and reason, 131, etc.; the cause of the variety in, 134-136; had its beginning in time, 253; shall come to an end, 255, etc.; another shall exist after this, 255; the end of, 262, etc.
Worlds, the, not similar, but dissimilar, i. 84.
Worship, to be given to God alone, and not to gods or demons, ii. 489-500; of the Father and the Son, 500, 501; equally acceptable to God in different languages, 522.
Wrath of God, the, ii. 237-239.

Zeno, the reasons why the followers of, abstain from adultery, ii. 484.
Zipporah, and the circumcision of Moses' son, ii. 318, 319.

END OF VOL. II.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

LANGE'S
COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

MESSRS. CLARK have now pleasure in intimating their arrangements, under the Editorship of Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF, for the Publication of Translations of the Commentaries of Dr. LANGE and his *Collaborateurs*, on the Old and New Testaments.

Of the OLD TESTAMENT, they have published the

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS, One Volume, imperial 8vo, to which is prefixed a Theological and Homiletical Introduction to the Old Testament, and a Special Introduction to Genesis, by Professor TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., comprising Excursus on all the chief subjects of Controversy.

COMMENTARY ON PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH, in One Volume.

Other Volumes on the Old Testament are in active preparation, and will be announced as soon as ready.

Messrs. CLARK have already published in the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY the **Commentaries on St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles.**

They had resolved to issue that on St. John only in the imperial 8vo form; but at the request of many of their Subscribers they publish it (without Dr. Schaff's Additions) in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, uniform with the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, which will be supplied to Subscribers at 10s. 6d.

There are now ready (in imperial 8vo, double column),

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, and COLOSSIANS. In One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS, PHILEMON, and HEBREWS. In One Vol.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, JOHN, and JUDE. In One Volume.

The New Testament is thus complete, with the exception of the Commentary on the Book of Revelation, which is in progress.

The **Commentaries on Matthew,** in one vol.; **Mark and Luke,** in one vol.; and on **Acts,** in one vol., may be had uniform with the above if desired.

Each of the above volumes (four on Old Testament and five on Epistles) will be supplied to Subscribers to the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY and ANTE-NICENE LIBRARY, or to Purchasers of complete sets of Old Testament (so far as published), and of Epistles, at 15s. The price to others will be 21s. each volume.

The Works of St. Augustine.

EDITED BY THE REV. MARCUS DODS, M.A.

MESSRS. CLARK have much pleasure in publishing the second issue of Translations of the Writings of ST. AUGUSTINE—viz.:

WRITINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE DONATIST CONTROVERSY. One Volume.

THE ANTI-PELAGIAN WORKS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. Vol. I.

The first issue comprised

THE 'CITY OF GOD,'

IN TWO VOLUMES.

Translated by the Rev. Marcus Dods, M.A.

They believe this will prove not the least valuable of their various Series, and no pains will be spared to make it so. The Editor has secured a most competent staff of Translators, and every care is being taken to secure not only accuracy, but elegance.

The Works of ST. AUGUSTINE to be included in the Series are (in addition to the 'CITY OF GOD')—

All the TREATISES in the PELAGIAN, and the four leading TREATISES in the DONATIST CONTROVERSY.

The TREATISES against FAUSTUS the Manichæan; on CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE; the TRINITY; the HARMONY OF THE EVANGELISTS; the SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

Also, the LECTURES on the GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN, the CONFESSIONS, a SELECTION from the LETTERS, the RETRACTATIONS, the SOLILOQUIES, and SELECTIONS from the PRACTICAL TREATISES.

All these works are of first-rate importance, and only a small proportion of them have yet appeared in an English dress. The SERMONS and the COMMENTARIES ON THE PSALMS having been already given by the Oxford Translators, it is not intended, at least in the first instance, to publish them.

The Series will include a LIFE OF ST. AUGUSTINE, by ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh.

The Series will probably extend to Sixteen or Eighteen Volumes. The Publishers will be glad to receive the *Names* of Subscribers as early as possible.

SUBSCRIPTION: Four Volumes for a Guinea, *payable in advance*, as in the case of the ANTE-NICENE SERIES (24s. when not paid in advance).

It is understood that Subscribers are bound to take at least the books of the first two years. Each Volume will be sold separately at (on an average) 10s. 6d. each Volume.

They trust the Subscribers to the ANTE-NICENE LIBRARY will continue their Subscription to this Series, and they hope to be favoured with an early remittance of the Subscription.

New and Cheaper Edition of Lange's Life of Christ.

Now complete, in Four Volumes, demy 8vo, price 28s. (Subscription price),

THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS, AND CONNECTION OF THE GOSPELS.

Translated from the German of

J. P. LANGE, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY THE REV. MARCUS DODS, M.A.

*** *This valuable Work has been out of print for some time, but has been much in demand. The Six Volumes now occupy Four; and whilst the whole matter is retained, it is published at a little cheaper price.*

Extract from Editor's Preface.

'The work of Dr. Lange, translated in the accompanying volumes, holds among books the honourable position of being the most complete Life of our Lord. There are other works which more thoroughly investigate the authenticity of the Gospel records, some which more satisfactorily discuss the chronological difficulties involved in this most important of histories, and some which present a more formal and elaborate exegetical treatment of the sources; but there is no single work in which all these branches are so fully attended to, or in which so much matter bearing on the main subject is brought together, or in which so many points are elucidated. The immediate object of this comprehensive and masterly work was to refute those views of the life of our Lord which had been propagated by Negative Criticism, and to substitute that authentic and consistent history which a truly scientific and enlightened criticism educes from the Gospels.'

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

This day is published, price 14s.,

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

BY

HERMANN CREMER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GREIFSWALD.

Translated from the German by

D. W. SIMON, PH. D.,

AND

WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

This work comprises such words as have their ordinary classical meaning changed or modified in Scripture, tracing their history in their transference from the Classics into the Septuagint and thence into the New Testament, and the gradual deepening and elevation of their meaning till they reach the fulness of New Testament thought.

Just published, in one vol. 8vo, price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK,

REGARDED AS THE BASIS OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.

BY DR. G. B. WINER.

Translated from the German, with large additions and full Indices, by Rev. W. F. MOULTON, M.A., Classical Tutor, Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond, and Prizeman in Hebrew and New Testament Greek in the University of London.

The additions by the Editor are very large, and will tend to make this great work far more useful and available for *English* students than it has hitherto been. The Indices have been greatly enlarged, but with discrimination, so as to be easily used. Students will admit, this is of vast importance. Altogether, the Publishers do not doubt that this will be the Standard Grammar of New Testament Greek.

'This is the standard classical work on the Grammar of the New Testament, and it is of course indispensable to every one who would prosecute intelligently the critical study of the most important portion of the inspired record. It is a great service to render such a work accessible to the English reader.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'We gladly welcome the appearance of Winer's great work in an English translation, and most strongly recommend it to all who wish to attain to a sound and accurate knowledge of the language of the New Testament. We need not say it is *the* Grammar of the New Testament. It is not only superior to all others, but *so* superior as to be by common consent the one work of reference on the subject. No other could be mentioned with it.' —*Literary Churchman.*

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK. LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

GETTY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
3 3125 01152 5272